Simpson. 220.

AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

Doctrine of the Trinity:

BEING

A Chronological View

OF WHAT IS RECORDED

CONCERNING,

THE PERSON OF CHRIST, THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND THE BLESSED TRINITY,

Whether in the sacred Writings, or in Jewish, Heathen, and Christian

AUTHORS.

By the Rev. DAVID SIMPSON, M. A.

I desire only to have things fairly represented, as they really are; no evidence smothered or stifled on either side. Let every reader see plainly what may be justly pleaded here, or there, and no more; and then let it be left to his impartial judgment, after a full view of the case. Misquotations and misrepresentations will do a good cause harm, and will not long be of service to a bad one. WATERLAND.

Macclesfield:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY EDWARD BAYLEY;

SOLD ALSO BY

Dilly, in London; and Clarke, in Manchester.

1798.

PREFACE.

THE author of this APOLOGY has often wished to find a complete treatise upon the doctrine of the TRINITY. Various are the persons who have written upon different branches of the subject, and said all that seemed necessary, to establish their own particular views; but what he wished to see, was, a full, yet compendious digest of the whole evidence, that every man might learn, at one view, what the Word of God, together with Heathen, Jewish, and Christian antiquity, actually contains upon this great subject, without having recourse to many books.

Not meeting with any work of this kind, which came up to the idea he had formed in his own mind, he resolved, as expeditiously as his other engagements, and an infirm state of health, would permit, to examine for himself, and to pursue his own plan of investigation. He does not know that the result of his inquiries will, by any means, afford that satisfaction to others, which he hath received from them himself: nor is he so vain as to suppose, that no method can be invented more likely to ascertain what are the real doctrines of holy scripture upon the subjects in question. Every man hath his own peculiar way of thinking; and every man is obliged, to the utmost of his power, not only to investigate truth for himself, but as far as he can, to guard the unwary from error, and labour the promotion of, what he conceives to be, important truth. His thoughts have proceeded in the following train. He hath, *First*, made some general observations upon the doctrines under consideration. *Secondly*, he hath traced the scriptures concerning our LORD's person and character, chronologically, through every age, from the beginning of the world, till the close of the divine canon. *Thirdly*, the doctrine concerning

the HOLY SPIRIT is examined through the Old and New Testaments, though not with that variety of observation as the former. This he did not conceive to be necessary; because, if the doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Divine Nature can be fairly established, it will not admit of a dispute what persons compose that mysterious unity. *Fourthly*, the doctrine of the TRINITY is traced in the same chronological manner as the divinity of Christ, and through the same extent of duration. A chronological method of investigation seemed preferable to every other, because the divinity of CHRIST, and HOLY SPIRIT, together with the doctrine of the SACRED TRINITY, have been, in some measure, hidden from ages and generations, and were not all at once, but gradually made known to the sons of men.

In the course of this inquiry, he hath produced the opinions of various Jews and Heathens, who lived both before, and since our Saviour's time. If they are found to have entertained similar sentiments with us upon these subjects, it will afford a strong presumption, that our interpretations of the Old Testament writings are just; and a certain confirmation, that our views of these great doctrines are not so novel as some zealous moderns would wish mankind to believe.

The Christian fathers also, who flourished in the three or four first centuries, are of great importance in this inquiry. They appear to him the very best and most authentic interpreters of holy scripture, so far, at least, as they are consistent one with another. They lived near the age of our Saviour. Some of them knew him personally. Others were apostles themselves, or conversed familiarly with the apostles. Several of them were great, most of them pious and learned men. They had, accordingly, much better opportunities of knowing in what sense the scriptures were originally understood, than we can have in these latter ages, unless we interpret them under the guidance of their writings. This is the method, which hath been pursued, by the most judicious and successful interpreters of scripture, in every period of the Christian church. And this, therefore, he lays down as a principle, from which we should cautiously depart, that the most reasonable and

and safe mode of understanding the Word of God, is, to consult the general sense of the Christian writers, who lived in the first centuries after the birth of our Saviour. They are our best human guides, at least so far as facts are concerned; and what they have concurred to establish, under the direction of the sacred writings, bids fair to be the truth.

In addition to the whole, he hath thrown into the notes the observations and reasonings of many of our first theologians, to corroborate and illustrate what had been advanced in the text; and he makes no question but these will be considered as the most valuable parts of the work. The opinions of the Fathers too, have been frequently added, to illustrate a variety of passages, and sometimes even more than once, besides the general view of their opinions which is given in the seventh part. This is the case likewise with some of the scriptural quotations; but then they are always produced with different views, and to prove a different doctrine. In short; the author hath used every help within the compass of a small library, in a country place, and without any advice or assistance from the learned. This he hath done for his own satisfaction. The labour hath been considerable, but not unpleasant. And he hath reaped the consolation of finding, that the divinity of CHRIST, and the HOLY SPIRIT, together with the doctrine of the BLESSED TRINITY, are not only contained in the pages of divine revelation, but have pervaded all nations and all time, with greater or less degrees of perspicuity.

But, these doctrines are attended with difficulty!—True.—This, however, is not our concern. The simple question is—Do the sacred writings contain these distinguishing peculiarities? If they do, the point in question is gained. *To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to that word, it is because there is no light in them.* The difficulty attending the comprehension of any particular representation of the nature of the Divine Being, supposing it to be clearly revealed, is no substantial objection. The first principle of natural religion contains innumerable—I had almost said—impossibilities. What is God? is involved in the most absolute incomprehensibility. And yet we must

must either admit the principle, or embrace ten thousand absurdities and impossibilities. Man was not made to cavil at every thing he doth not fully comprehend (for what does he fully comprehend?) but modestly to investigate the truth—to submit to the best evidence the nature of the case will admit—and zealously to adore the Author of his being, according to the fullest light, which reason and revelation have afforded him.

It is much to be apprehended, various mistakes will be discovered by the attentive reader in the course of so long a work, especially in the quotations, references, and translations. The Author deprecates the severity of criticism. He can assure the reader, however, much attention has been paid to these matters, and he is not conscious of having, in any instance, perverted a sentiment to favour an hypothesis. He sincerely wishes truth to have its full scope. If any passage is turned from its proper meaning, he is not conscious of it, is sorry for it, and intreats the reader to restore it to its genuine signification. It has been his endeavour to bring every thing that is material upon the great doctrines under consideration, into one view, to make certain observations upon such as seemed to need it, and then to leave the serious Christian to draw his own conclusions. He contends for no human creeds or explications whatever. He would not give a rush for a million of them. They may be right, or they may be wrong. He troubles not his head about them. The scripture is enough for him. Every other authority is human. Christ alone is king in his own church.

It will be perceived, that one or more asterisks are placed before several of the quotations from scripture. These are designed to draw the reader's attention to such passages as are more important than ordinary, and absolutely conclusive against some peculiarity of the Arian or Socinian schemes.

Some of the other scriptures quoted, he freely confesses, appear to him fanciful or impertinent, nor does he mean to repose any serious stress upon them. But, as they have all been brought forward, by one or another, he has noticed them in their respective places, bearing his testimony, at the same time, against all evi-

dence

dence that is not solid and substantial. Nothing will stand, nothing can stand, but what is so. Nor ought we even to wish to extract meanings from texts, which the Divine Spirit never intended. We always injure the cause of truth, when we attempt to make scripture prove too much.

The strength of the following evidence will depend very mainly upon the connected view of it. But though every text of scripture, which is brought to support any particular doctrine, were set aside, but one, as being little or nothing to the purpose, that one ought to be considered as conclusive, till the validity of it can be fairly disproved.

It is disingenuous to conclude we have subverted any particular doctrine, when we have only tried our strength with its feeblest supports, while its main arguments are left untouched.

As the author avows himself a believer of the pre-existence and divinity of the Saviour of mankind, together with the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, after the fullest investigation and most serious consideration of these subjects of which he is capable, the reader will peruse those parts of this Apology with caution, and weigh the premises and conclusions with the most scrupulous exactness.

He is not backward to confess, that to him these doctrines appear essential to the Christian scheme of redemption. If others are of a different opinion, he has no quarrel with them. Every man must examine and judge for himself. To our own Master we stand or fall.

He has no fear but the genuine truths of Christianity shall ultimately prevail, whatever those truths may be. God will vindicate his own cause. The gates of hell have long been at work to subvert the whole system of divine truth, but they have not yet prevailed, nor is it to be suspected they ever will. The great Head of the church, indeed, is shaking the nations, and is about to purge his floor. The gold, silver, and precious stones shall abide the day of trial; but the chaff will be blown away; the wood, hay, and stubble shall be burnt up; all superstitious ordinances shall be subverted; but the Word of the Lord shall endure forever.

Here

Here then the author of this treatise posits his faith. Antichrist may fall; superstitious observances may cease; religious establishments may be tumbled into ruins; empires and kingdoms may be overturned; princes and governours may be deposed; the wise men of the world may take part with the enemies of truth; error and delusion may run like wild-fire among the thickest ranks of the people; unbelievers may rage, and minute philosophers imagine a vain thing; but the *Bible* shall arise out of its present obscurity, and, being stripped of all human appendages, shall be universally had in honour; the method of redeeming a lost race therein revealed shall be generally seen and embraced; the enemies of evangelical religion shall be confounded world without end; Jesus shall reign, maugre all opposition, in his glorified human body, at the right hand of the Majesty on high, till all the ends of the earth have seen his great salvation, and every opposing power is brought into complete subjection. At the present moment, he is dashing the nations together like the vessels of a potter; but yet, notwithstanding the confusion and disorder of the world, of which we have heard so much, and which we ourselves may yet possibly witness; all the dispensations of creation, providence, and grace, are founded in wisdom and goodness, and shall wind up, to the Redeemer's everlasting credit.

DAVID SIMPSON.

MACCLESFIELD,
Jan. 1. 1798.

INTRODUCTION.

A RIGHT knowledge of God, and the relation we stand in to him, are essentially necessary, it should seem, in all ordinary cases, to the attainment of future felicity. If our general notions of the Divine Being are wrong, considered as an object of worship, we adore a creature of our own imagination, rather than the living and true God. If we are not well acquainted also, with our own real and relative state respecting him, it is impossible we should demean ourselves in a becoming and acceptable manner: for, we should ever remember, that very different conduct is due from an innocent creature, to that which is due from one in a state of degeneracy and moral depravity.

An innocent creature can be in no need of a Saviour, in no need of repentance, in no need of pardon, in no need of sanctification. Guilty fears, dread of God's wrath, remorse of conscience, and the like uneasy sensations of mind, are things to which he must ever be a stranger, while he retains his integrity. But a sinner, as such, is in want of pardon; and, if his Creator thinks not proper to grant that pardon, by an absolute act of sovereignty, he is in want of a Saviour; and if his nature, at the same time that it contracted guilt, contracted also a moral stain, and became depraved, he will need a Sanctifier: repentance, fear, dread, remorse, and all the other concomitants of guilt, are not less the sure consequences thereof, than they are becoming his situation and circumstances.

This is the state of human nature. *We have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God,* and he hath declared he will not pardon, by an absolute act of grace: and if we have all sinned, and God will not pardon, by an absolute act of grace, we stand in need of a Saviour: and if our natures have contracted a moral taint, we want some being or other, to restore our lapsed powers. Fear, dread, and remorse of conscience become us. And not to repent, not to be grieved and sorry, not to be possessed with fear, dread, remorse, and the like uneasy sensations, is unnatural, and infinitely unbecoming our situation.

But, if we are in want of a Saviour, and if a Saviour has been graciously provided for us, it will become us, not only to believe in him, but narrowly to examine, under the guidance of God's own manifestations, into the nature and offices of that Saviour; and, at the same time, closely to consider, in what respects we stand in need of his assistance. These two views will have a tendency to throw light upon each other. And, if we act a reasonable part, our dependance upon, and confidence in the Redeemer, will be in exact proportion to our own wants, his ability, and the knowledge we have of God, the Redeemer, and ourselves. For instance; if we think ourselves innocent, the gospel of Christ is to us no better *than sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal*; it is a pretended remedy where there is no need. And if we think ourselves, though not innocent, yet pretty good, and in no eminent danger of future misery, our love to Christ will be faint, weak, feeble, almost nothing. *To whom little is forgiven, they will love little.* If we are convinced of sin, and of our dangerous condition, so far as to be weary and distressed with its burden, the news of salvation by Jesus Christ will be glad tidings of great joy. *To whom much is forgiven, they will love much.* On the other hand, if we consider God as a being all mercy, without any regard to the veracity, justice, and holiness of his nature; then Christ will not be so super-

eminently

eminently precious; because we shall not discover either the necessity or fitness of his mediation.

If we look upon our blessed Saviour as a mere man only, then we shall esteem him but little more than as Moses, or as one of the Prophets. If we consider him at all, in short, with regard to his superior nature, as a created being, though of the most exalted kind, our regard to him, and esteem for him, will be that of one creature to another; considerable indeed, according to the rank he bears; but far from that supreme regard, that unbounded confidence, that matchless love, which are due to him, in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

From this consideration it may be observed how necessary it is, that we should have a competent scriptural knowledge of the person and offices of the Redeemer, if we would pay unto him a reasonable service. If he is a mere man, he ought to be looked upon as such, by all created intelligences. If he is but an angel, though of the highest order, he ought to be regarded as an angel. He ought not, surely, to have religious adoration paid him; nor is he capable, scripture and reason being judge, of making satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of the world.

But, if he is God and man ineffably united in one mediator: if he is "God, of the substance of the Fa-"ther, begotten before the worlds; and man, of the "substance of his mother, born in the world: if he is "perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul "and human flesh subsisting," then only, as it seems to me, he is, and can be, such a Redeemer as we stand in need of. Then only he is, in common with the Father, the proper object of divine worship, prayer, praise, and adoration. And if he is God, equal with the Father, and we Christians have in the bible sufficient evidence of this matter of fact, it must be an inexcusable dishonour to his glorious majesty, to demean him to the level of a mere man, or to the more exalted rank of an angel. If,

I say, he is, in his divine nature, equal with the Father in majesty, glory and power; not to honour him even as we honour the Father, is, to dethrone him, and, for any thing we know to the contrary, will one day be resented by him upon his adversaries. To illustrate my meaning by an historical fact: Maximinus, emperor of Rome, no sooner came to the throne, than he adopted his son Maximus with him, as partner and emperor, with equal power and authority. Let it be supposed, that we, being the subjects of Maximinus, refused to pay the same respect to Maximus, the son, which we did to Maximinus, the father, under a pretence that there could be but one emperor in any one empire: if instead of treating Maximus as emperor, we had upon all occasions considered him only as an equal, or as the first nobleman in the country: would not this have been to degrade him, and to deny the emperor of Rome, in a very strong sense? To have degraded him in such a manner would, probably, have mortified him beyond forbearance. One may, at least, venture to assert, that his dignity would have been so far affected, as to cause him to with-hold future favours from us. And if Maximus's power were equal to his inclination, we should have assuredly felt the weight of his indignation. Our honouring the father, as emperor, could not make satisfaction for dishonouring the son. But if we should go still farther, and instead of treating Maximus as emperor of Rome, or as the first nobleman in the country, we should have considered him in no higher a light than a mere animal, destitute of all moral and religious principle; and, moreover, if we should have used our most strenuous endeavours to make all his subjects consider him as a being of an inferior order, and unworthy even to rank with intelligent creatures, he would have reason to reprobate our conduct with still greater severity.

In like manner, if Jesus Christ, in his higher nature, possesses divinity; if he is of the same essence with his heavenly Father, as every son in this world is of the same

same nature and essence with his earthly parent;[1] and if he hath made satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of mankind; to deny that divinity, and to reject that satisfaction;[2] to deny and reject that, in which alone his truest glory consists, and to degrade him to the level of a *mere* man, is, surely, *to deny the Lord that bought us:* And it may be left for every man to judge, whether it be not one of those *damnable heresies* spoken of by the apostle of the circumcision.[3]

Be this, however, as it may, I must own it has often appeared to me, when I have reflected upon these subjects, that our blessed Lord, in every age of the Christian church, hath clearly shewn his disapprobation of these degrading doctrines. For, in what societies soever the divinity of the Son and Spirit of God has been

[1] "For as nature itself hath dictated, that he must be believed to be "man, who is off man; so the same nature hath dictated likewise, "that he must be believed to be God, who is off God."

Novatian De Trinit. cap. 11.

"In all effects that are voluntary, the cause must be prior to the "effect; as the father is to the son, in human generation. But in "all that are necessary, the effect must be co-eval with the cause; "as the stream is with the fountain, and light with the sun. Had the "sun been eternal in its duration, light would have been co-eternal "with it. Was the fountain from everlasting, the stream would be "equally from everlasting too. And the Son of God, in the faith "and confession of the Jews, was the Second Jehovah, or the Me-"diate God of the universe; an Eternal De-rivation from the Eter-"nal Fountain of Deity, an Everlasting De-radiation from the Ever-"lasting Sun of Divinity, in God the Father."

Whitaker's Origin of Arianism, p. 175.

[2] "If we trace the Christian religion through the various revolu-"tions of the church, we shall observe two doctrines, which, beyond "all the rest, mark with a distinguishing lustre the creed which just-"ly deserves the appellation of catholic. Explications of those doc-"trines may vary; but the grand essentials of them seem to be in-"terwoven with the original texture of Christian faith; I mean the "doctrines of the Divinity and Atonement of Christ: doctrines "alike unknown to the Koran of Mahomet and the Creed of Soci-"nus."

Professor White's Notes to his Sermons, p. 61.

[3] See 2 Peter 2. 1—3, and Jude 3, 4.

rejected, there also hath been a visible declension, not only in piety and good morals, but usually in the members of such societies, except where the officiating minister happens to be a man of very popular talents. Let us, moreover, look through the kingdom where we please, and attend to the state of the Arian and Socinian congregations, and we shall generally, if not universally, discover among them, a great want of serious godliness, much compliance with the spirit of the world, and a sovereign contempt of all those who embrace the system of orthodoxy.[4] As they unanimously treat the Son of God and the Holy Spirit, with, comparative, contempt; so the grace of that Son, and the communications of that Spirit, without which we can do no manner of thing that is good, seem to be restrained and with-held from them. And this is perfectly reasonable, if those blessed Persons are treated with indignity and impropriety by them. On the contrary, wherever the orthodox principles are plainly and faithfully inculcated, there we see the congregations increase, the people are converted from the error of their ways, become serious in their spirits, moral in their conduct, and, usually, die triumphing in the God of their salvation. It is very remarkable too, that when Arianism, Sabellianism, and various other Isms, had over-run the churches in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, it pleased God, soon after, to *sweep them with the besom of destruction.* The barbarous nations broke in upon the western churches in the fifth age, and carried slaughter and devastation wherever they came. Upon a large part of the eastern churches Mahomet came in the seventh age, and propagated with fire, sword, and wonderful success, his horrid delusion. And when the period arrives, that Socinianism

[4] "To see such men as bishop Hurd in this class of writers, (the "defenders of orthodoxy) when he is qualified to class with Tillot-"son, Hoadley, and Clarke, equally excites one's pity and indigna-"tion!"

Priestley's Corrup. of Christ. vol. 2. p. 471.

nianism becomes the prevailing religion of this country, as it shall in a little time, if the predictions of some warm contenders for it may be credited, [5] it is exceedingly probable, that the indignation of the Almighty, with a flood of vengeance, will follow hard after. To illustrate my meaning again by another historical fact: Let it be supposed, that when Carus, emperor also of Rome, joined his two sons Carinus and Numerianus with him, making them partners in the empire, and giving them equal power and authority with himself: let it be supposed, I say, that any of their subjects had rejected the authority of either Carinus, or Numerianus, or both, under a pretence that Carinus was the only proper and lawful emperor; in such a case, the opposers of their honour and dignity could have had no just reason to complain, if the two sons should, not only have withheld their favours from such refractory subjects, but even have wrecked their vengeance upon them.—The application is obvious.

Those, who are so zealous in degrading our blessed Saviour, bring us several passages of scripture to prove, that he is a man, and, of consequence, inferior to the Father; such as—*There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*: And—*God hath commanded all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained.* Now these, and all such like passages, are really nothing to the purpose for which they are brought; because we ourselves also, as earnestly contend as the adversaries to the divinity of Jesus, that he is perfect man as well as perfect God. [6] It is absurd, therefore, and disingenuous, to

[5] See Priestley on the Importance of Free Inquiry, passim.

[6] "If our Saviour be spoken of thus exclusively in his different natures; it ought not to be matter of wonder, that this Son of God and Son of Man should be described at times, with all that difference of character which subsists, in an infinite degree, between

dwell upon this, while we insist upon the truth and importance of such declarations as strenuously as they can do. If the adversaries of the divinity of Christ would say any thing to the purpose, they should shew us how all those passages of scripture, which speak of him in the highest stile of deity, can be easily reconciled with those, which speak of his simple manhood. Till this is done they must give us leave to think, with the catholic church in all ages, that Christ is perfect God and perfect man;[7] that the deity and humanity are ineffably united in him, as the soul and the body are ineffably united in a human being. Upon this supposition, all the seeming inconsistences in holy scripture, concerning the character of Messiah, vanish, and speak the same harmonious truth.[8]

It

" God and man. It ought not to be matter of wonder, that he who " in the former capacity was to *make the dead hear his voice*, should " in the latter *receive authority to execute judgment*: that he, who in " the former *knew all things*, should in the latter *not know the day, and " hour, when judgment was to be executed by himself*: that he, whom " in the former *no man knoweth but the Father*, should tell the Jews " in the latter, that *they both knew him, and whence he was*: that he " by whom as God *all things consist*, should say of himself, as man, " *and now I am no more in the world*. The importance of attending " to this distinction between our Saviour's natures, may be inferred " from the question which he himself put to his insidious enemies, " *how Christ could be David's Lord, and at the same time his Son?* " A question, by which they were so affected, that, as St. Matthew " declares, *no man was able to answer him a word: neither durst any " man from that day forth ask him any more questions*.

Eveleigh's Two Sermons on the Trinity, p. 36 and 37.

[7] " To reject or disbelieve things, because we understand not the " whole of their nature, modes of existence or fitness, is not reason " but stupidity. It is either to make our minds the rule of truth, or " to affirm that, because God has not given us all the reasons of " things, it is not possible there should be any; both which are " equally irrational." Dr. Ellis's Knowledge of Divine Things from Revelation, not from Reason or Nature, p. 260.

[8] There is an excellent little tract written by Mr. William Hey, Surgeon, of Leeds in Yorkshire, entitled, " A short Defence of the Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ," which is worthy the attention of the public. It is designed as an antidote to some small pieces published by Dr. Priestley against our Lord's Divinity. While I recommend the whole pamphlet to the perusal of the Reader, I will take

It is not improbable but some persons will be ready to say, by way of getting clear of all these difficulties in a compendious manner, suited to their own indolent, or negligent

the liberty of presenting him with an extract from it on the subject before us:—"Those who deny the divinity of our Lord Jesus "Christ," says this valuable writer, "bring us many passages of "scripture to prove, that he was a man and inferior to the Father; "but these passages are really nothing to their purpose, for they do "but prove what we ourselves contend for. We believe that the "Eternal Word not only took our nature upon him, but also, that he "sustained the office of Mediator on our account; that through his "own voluntary condescension, he was sent by the Father into the "world; fulfilled all righteousness in our nature, and became obedi-"ent even unto death; that in consequence of this humiliation, he "was highly exalted, made head over all things to the church, and "constituted the judge of quick and dead; and that, finally, when "the work for which he undertook the office of Mediator shall be "fully accomplished, he will then lay aside the peculiar dignities of "his office, or mediatorial kingdom, and reign in the preceding dig-"nity of his nature forever and ever.

"There is not, therefore, the least contradiction in representing "Christ as inferior to the Father, with respect to his human nature, "yet equal to him with respect to his divine; for the different re-"presentations, and *seeming* contradictions in the scriptural character "of our Saviour plainly prove, that his *compound person* partook of "natures essentially different from each other. We use a similar "manner of speaking with regard to ourselves, and on a similar ac-"count. When a writer calls mankind sometimes mortal, sometimes "immortal; at one time corruptible, at another incorruptible; now "vile, then precious; instead of charging him with contradictions, "we immediately perceive, that he has a reference to those totally "different substances, a material body and immaterial soul, which "are, in an inexplicable manner, united in us. Let us use the same "degree of common sense with regard to the scriptures, and all the "difficulties concerning the character of Christ will vanish. There "will then appear no contrariety in calling him the Son of man, and "yet the Lord of glory. Luke 19. 10.—1 Cor. 2. 8. But it lies "upon those who deny the divinity of Christ, to reconcile those "passages of scripture, which attribute divine perfections to Christ, "and speak of him as God, with those that are expressive of his "inferiority to the Father. And till this is satisfactorily done, they "must give us leave to think, that the former refer to his original "nature, and the latter to his assumed manhood, and mediatorial "character; which appears to me to be the only way of reconcil-"ing those scriptures that otherwise would be *quite contradictory*."

negligent state of mind—It is of little or no importance what we think, or what we believe concerning the Redeemer and Sanctifier, if we are but virtuous, and charitable.—

These qualifications are, beyond doubt, essential parts of the character of a believer in the Son of God; but yet they are not the whole of it. If the Son and Spirit are by nature possessed of divinity, they ought to be worshipped.* If they are not by nature possessed of divinity, they ought not to be worshipped. If they are by

* "The essence of natural religion may be said to consist in religious regards to God the Father Almighty: And the essence of revealed religion, as distinguished from natural, to consist in religious regards to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. And the obligations we are under, of paying these religious regards to each of these Divine Persons respectively, arises from the respective relations, which they each stand in to us. How these relations are made known, whether by reason or revelation, makes no alteration in the case; because the duties arise out of the relations themselves, not out of the manner in which we are informed of them. The Son and Spirit have each his proper office, in that great dispensation of Providence, the redemption of the world; the one our Mediator, the other our Sanctifier. Does not then the duty of religious regards to both these Divine Persons, as immediately arise to the view of reason, out of the very nature of these offices and relations; as the inward good will and kind intention, which we owe to our fellow creatures, arises out of the common relations between us and them? But it will be asked, what are the inward religious regards, appearing thus obviously due to the Son and Holy Spirit, as arising not merely from command in scripture, but from the very nature of the revealed relations, which they stand in to us? I answer, the religious regards of reverence, honour, love, gratitude, fear, hope. In what external manner this inward worship is to be expressed, is a matter of pure revealed command; as perhaps the external manner, in which God the Father is to be worshipped, may be more so than we are ready to think. But the worship, the internal worship itself, to the Son and Holy Ghost, is no father matter of pure revealed command, than as the relations they stand in to us, are matter of pure revelation: For the relations being known, the obligations to such internal worship are obligations of reason, arising out of those relations themselves. In short, the history of the gospel as immediately shews us the reason of these obligations, as it shews us the meaning of the words, Son and Holy Ghost.

Butler's Analogy, part 2. chap. 1.

by nature possessed of divinity, our public forms contain a reasonable service. If they are not by nature possessed of divinity, our religious worship, every sabbath day, is full of gross idolatry.

The unity of God is a first principle in all true religion, whether natural or revealed. The scripture is full of it.—*Thou shalt have none other Gods but me.*[1]—*Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God, there is none else besides him. Know therefore this day and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else.—Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.—See now that I, even I am he, and there is no God with me.—There is none besides thee.—Who is God save the Lord, and who is a rock save our God?—Thou, even thou, art Lord alone.—Thou art God alone.—Before thee there was no God formed, neither shall there be any after thee.—Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God. I know not any.—I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides me.—I am God and there is none like me; before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.—Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

The first and fundamental principle of religion then, is, that there is a God. The second, that there is but one living and true God. And the third, that religious worship, and divine honours, are to be paid to this one living and true God alone. Either, therefore, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the true scriptural sense of the words, are this one living and true God, though in a way inexplicable by us, or else we transgress these fundamental laws of nature and of God, every time we pray and

[1] "One considerable objection against the Arian scheme, is, that "it stands in opposition to the first and great commandment; introducing two Gods, and two objects of worship; not only against "scripture, but also against the unanimous sense of the Christian "church, from the beginning, and of the Jewish before; which "together are the safest and best comment we can have upon "scripture." Waterland's Eight Sermons, preface, p. 30.

and ascribe glory to either the Son or the Holy Spirit.

This being, confessedly, the real state of the case, it no longer remains, I should think, a matter of indifference, whether side of the question we take. The doctrine of the divinity of Christ,[2] and the blessed Spirit, is by no means that speculative and insignificant thing some would persuade us it is. It seems rather to enter most essentially into the whole scheme of redemption. All the other doctrines of the gospel depend upon it.[3] It is the foundation and corner-stone of that wonderful structure.

Remove

[2] "The divinity of Christ is a scripture truth as much as the divi-
" nity of the Father; and one is no more a metaphysical speculati-
" on than the other. Besides that it is strangely improper and absurd
" to call these principles pure speculations, which are of so great im-
" portance for the regulating our worship, that we can neither omit
" to worship Christ, if they are true, without the greatest impiety;
" nor perform it, if they are false, without being guilty of idolatry."
Waterland's Eight Sermons, pref. p. 26.

[3] "Many apprehend the doctrine of the Trinity to be what is call-
" ed a speculative doctrine only, that is to say, a doctrine concerning
" which men may think, and conjecture, and reason, and dispute
" for their amusement, but of no effect or importance in a religious
" life. This is a considerable mistake in judgment; and to prove
" that it is so, let us only ask one question:—What is the doctrine
" of most importance to man, in his religious concerns? Undoubted-
" ly, it is that of his redemption from sin and sorrow, from death
" and hell, to righteousness and joy, immortality and glory. But
" of such redemption what account do the scriptures give us? By
" whom was the gracious scheme originally concerted, and after-
" wards carried into execution? Was it not by the three persons of
" the ever-blessed and adorable Trinity?

" It was not an after-thought, a new design, formed upon the
" transgression and fall of our first parents. That event was fore-
" seen, and provision made accordingly: for upon the very best au-
" thority we are informed, that Christ was *the Lamb slain from the*
" *foundation of the world*; that is (for it cannot be otherwise under-
" stood) slain in effect, in the divine purpose and council. It is
" likewise said, that *grace was given us in Christ Jesus, before the*
" *world began*. The words intimate, that, previous to the creation
" of the world, something had passed in our favour above; that the
" plan of our future redemption was then laid; that some agreement,
" some covenant, relative to it, had been entered into: *grace was*
" *given us*, not in our proper persons, for as yet we were not—we
" had no being—but in the person of him who was afterward to be-

Remove it, and the whole fabric of evangelical truth falls

" come our representative, our Saviour—*in Christ Jesus*. Now the " plan must have been laid, the covenant entered into, by the parties " who have been since graciously pleased to concern themselves in " its execution. Who these are we cannot be ignorant. It was the " Son of God who took our nature upon him, and in that nature made " a full and sufficient oblation, satisfaction, and atonement, for the " sins of the world. It was the Father who accepted such oblation, " satisfaction, and atonement, and in consequence forgave those " sins. It was the Holy Spirit, who came forth from the Father " and the Son, through the preaching of the word, and the adminis- " tration of the sacraments, by his enlightening, healing, and com- " forting grace, to apply to the hearts of men, for all the purposes " of pardon, sanctification, and salvation, the merits and benefits of " that oblation, satisfaction, and atonement.

" Say no more, then, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a matter " of curiosity and amusement only. Our religion is founded upon " it: for what is Christianity, but a manifestation of the three divine " persons as engaged in the great work of man's redemption, begun, " continued, and to be ended by them, in their several relations of " Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier; " three persons, one God? If there be no Son of God, where is our " redemption? If there be no Holy Spirit, where is our sanctificati- " on? Without both, where is our salvation? And if these two per- " sons be any thing less than divine, why are we baptized, equally, " in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost? " Let no man therefore deceive you: *This is the true God, and eter- " nal life.*"

Bishop Horne's Discourse on the Trinity, p. 43—45.—See also Trapp on the Trinity, p. 4—6.

Mr. Hawker likewise, in his very sensible Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, says, " The divinity of Jesus, I conceive to be the " chief corner-stone in the edifice of Christianity. Remove this " from the building and the whole fabric immediately totters. The " foundation is shaken to the very centre. There appears at once " an evident disproportion between the end and the means, the im- " portance of the object proposed, and the person by whom it was " accomplished. And then the great doctrine of atonement and ex- " piation, by the blood of its author, falls to the ground, and all the " rich promises of the gospel are done away."—

Again:—" The divinity of Jesus is so conspicuous a feature in " the gospel, and is supported by evidences which press upon us so " closely on every side, that, I flatter myself, there is not any one " point of Christ's religion more capable of being proved and ascer- " tained, than his claim to a divine nature."

Pages 8th. and 40th.

falls to the ground, [4] and we are reduced again to a mere system of moral philosophy. We acknowledge, indeed, and glory in the truth, that the holy gospel doth contain a system of moral philosophy, and the most perfect, by many degrees, with which the world was ever favoured: [5] but we insist upon it, as a truth of all conceiveable importance, that it contains far more; that it opens a new and living way, whereby sinners may be reconciled unto God, through the alone mediation of his own dear and only-begotten Son. And the divine origin of it is displayed by its wonderful suitableness to the situation of man. All that he wants it contains. Not that it is designed to bring about infallibly the salvation of the whole human race, neither the salvation of all those who come within the sound of it. Rather, it is intended as a scheme of redemption for cureable dispositions only. And, therefore, God hath afforded us all the evidence of its veracity that his wisdom saw needful for such dispositions, rather than all the evidence his power might have afforded for the conviction of the careless, obstinate, high-minded, and conceited inquirers after truth. And, in pursuance of this design, its doctrines are as admirably

[4] "The faith of the holy Trinity is so fundamental to the Christian religion, that if Christianity be worth contending for, that is. "For if God have not an eternal Son, and an eternal Spirit, the "whole mystery of our redemption by Christ, and of our sanctification by the Spirit, which in its consequences is the whole of the "gospel, and distinguishes it from all other religions, is utterly lost." Sherlock's Socinian Controversy, p. 1.

Let the Reader, who has any doubts upon his mind concerning the Importance of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, read carefully Bishop Bull's Judgment of the Catholic Church of the three first centuries concerning the necessity of believing, that our Lord Jesus Christ is true God, and Dr. Waterland's Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and he will receive all the satisfaction he can reasonably expect or desire. The Socinians pretend to despise these books. They do well. It is much easier to pretend to despise such authors, than to answer them.

[5] "The morality of the gospel of Christ doth so excel that of "other books, that to give a man a full knowledge of morality, he "need read no other book but the New Testament." Lock.

admirably calculated to try the obedience of our understanding, as its precepts that of our will.[6] Now, as man consists of two distinct, yet essential parts, so the vices to which we are prone respect both these parts of our constitution. For we may be very free from the vices peculiar to the body, and yet extremely addicted to those of the mind. The former are more peculiar to the vulgar, the latter to the learned and philosophic part of our race. By subjection to the one, we resemble the brute creation; by obedience to the other, the apostate spirits. We ought, therefore, to be serious, and lay aside all pride and conceitedness in our understanding, as well as superfluity of naughtiness in our passions, and attend with humility and prayer to the things which God hath revealed concerning himself. The truths of his word are sufficiently plain to the humble and sincere inquirer; but there is obscurity enough to baffle and confound the most enlarged minds of those, who are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own conceits. *Clouds and darkness are round about him*, though *righteousness and equity are the habitation of his throne.*—

None

[6] Dr. Watts has the same idea:—"It is as possible and as proper, that God should propose doctrines to our understanding, which it cannot comprehend, as duties to our practice, which we cannot see the reason of; for he is equally superior to our understanding and will, and he puts the obedience of both to a trial."

Appendix to Watts's life by Johnson and Palmer, p. 120.

Lord Bacon speaks to the same purpose: "The prerogative of God," says this great man, "comprehends the whole man; and is extended, as well to the *reason*, as to the *will* of man: that is, that man renounce himself wholly, and draw near to God. Wherefore, as we are to *obey his law*, though we find a reluctation in our *will*; so we are to *believe his word*, though we find a reluctation in our *reason*: for if we believe only that which is agreeable to our *reason*, we give assent to the *matter*, not to the *author*, which is no more than we would do towards a suspected and discredited witness.—Sacred theology is grounded on, and must be deduced from, the Oracles of God; and not from the light of nature, or the dictates of reason.—*To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*"

Advancement of Learning, p. 468.

None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—The meek will he guide in judgment, and the meek will he learn his way.—And God said, Go and tell this people, who are proud, wicked, conceited, and self-righteous, *Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not: make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed.*

All these scriptures were most awfully fulfilled, when our Saviour was upon earth. The modest inquirers after truth among the Jews sufficiently discovered, from the writings of Moses and the Prophets, that he was the true Messiah. But yet, it is a notorious fact, that the bulk of the people, and especially the more learned and polite part of the nation, rejected him as an impostor and deceiver. They did nor reject him for want of evidence that he was the Messiah; for there was evidence enough to satisfy any impartial inquirer; but they rejected him through pride of heart, and carnal views and expectations. They approved not his appearance and pretensions. His views were upon another world, theirs were upon this; and therefore they rejected him without faithfully examining whether he were the Christ or not. In vain did our blessed Saviour reason, expostulate, and appeal to his own miracles, and their sacred writings. They had made up their minds; and he must either erect a worldly standard, or he shall not be Christ. Instead of learning from the scripture what the character of Messiah was to be, they brought their own erroneous ideas to the word of God, and were determined it should speak their language.[7] No evidence was sufficient. Lazarus is raised from the dead before their

[7] Many a time has their conduct herein been imitated both by religious communities and individuals. Indeed we are all too prone to bring our own principles to the bible, rather than come to it with the simplicity of little children to learn from it what the genuine doctrines of Christianity are. We take for granted what is to

their eyes. No; this will not do. Rather than give credit

be proved. It is more flattering to the pride of our hearts to be teachers than learners. And a kind of obstinacy in maintaining preconceived opinions, without due modesty and examination, is no uncommon thing. The motives, however, may be very different, when the conduct itself is equally absurd. Thus the Roman Catholics at the council of Constance took for granted John Huss and Jerome of Prague were both heretics. They were determined to destroy them; and the strongest appeals, the most eloquent oratory,* and the most glaring innocence were of no avail. They must die.

So when good bishop Latimer, at the time of the Reformation, was brought upon his trial, he was so sensible of the determination of his enemies to destroy him, that he gave himself very little trouble, but committed his cause to God. Truth was not the thing they wanted. He must submit, or die. Yea, and if he had submitted, it is probable, nothing but his blood could have satisfied his adversaries, as the excellent Cranmer, indeed, experienced in the following year.

Voltaire too, actuated by motives very different, took for granted, without due examination, the falsehood of the bible, and ridiculed both it, and every thing serious, all the days of his life.

His more noble countryman, the amiable author of Telemachus, actuated by an excess of humility, or some worse principle, immediately upon the condemnation of his book, entitled Maxims of the Saints, submits to the sentence, prohibits the reading of the book, supposing it erroneous, and yet never offered to shew where the error lay. The Pope condemned it, and therefore he would submit.

Le Pluche, another French writer, and author of Spectacle de la Nature, a work known to all the world, was a believer in all the mysteries of his church, even to an extreme; and when certain freethinkers used to express their astonishment, that a man of Abbe Le Pluche's force of understanding could think so like the vulgar, he used to say, "I glory in this: it is more reasonable to believe the "word of God, than to follow the vain and uncertain lights of rea-"son." An excellent conclusion, if what he pretended to believe had been the word of God.

The justly celebrated Dr. Clarke also, in his book on the Trinity, takes for granted what ought to be proved, and what never can be proved, that God is, strictly speaking, "one simple, uncompounded, "undivided, intelligent agent, or person; who is the author of all "being, and the fountain of all power." And, having thus begged the question, and laid this pecarious foundation, he proceeds to build the whole superstructure of his book upon it. But if the premises be denied, what becomes of the conclusion? Dr. Clarke, with all his

* See a fine example of this in Gilpin's Life of Jerome of Prague, p. 261.

credit to his mission, both Lazarus and Christ must be put

extraordinary penetration, knew no more of the essence of a God in one person, than he knew of the essence of one in three. As to his book on this subject, it must be acknowledged, that the plan is excellent; but it is evident there was a strong bias upon his mind. Hence he takes every opportunity, and sometimes very unreasonably, of lowering the character of Christ, by giving up as spurious some texts of scripture which speak of his dignity, and refining others, till their spirit is evaporated and gone.

But the most faulty part of his book is that where he quotes from the Fathers. It is well known, that whatever the scripture doctrine may be, the Fathers were pretty unanimous in their belief of the divinity of Christ: and yet Dr. Clarke, from his manner of quoting them, would lead any person, who is a stranger to their writings, to suppose they were all on his side of the question. This is not ingenuous. In the same way of proceeding one may prove any thing either from scripture or the fathers. This great man was herein to be blamed. It is agreed on all hands, that Christ is both man, and mediator between God and man. What avails it therefore to prove what all are agreed in? If we would say any thing honestly and to good purpose, either from the scriptures or fathers, we should produce all their highest and most magnificent declarations concerning the Son of God, and shew how they can be made consistent with the lowest, and those which describe him as human. And we should give all the highest descriptions their full force and meaning, as well as the lowest. Every conduct unlike this is not fair and honest. We should be as willing to do the Son full justice as the Father. The Father will thank no man for belying and misrepresenting the Son. The Reader will find a good account of Dr. Clarke's book on the Trinity in Bishop Horsley's Tracts, page 279, &c.

Dr. Priestley proceeds in his controversy on the Trinity much in the same manner with Dr. Clarke, tho' he embraces a very different system. He takes for granted and lays it down as a first principle, that the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement are impossible, and such as no miracles can prove, and then he proceeds to mangle and distort the holy scriptures, to make them speak a language agreeable to the notions he has formed, to the utter subversion of common sense. The Doctor is certainly a very laborious and ingenious man, and, upon some subjects, has few equals: but ingenious men have sometimes strange whims, and render themselves extremely ridiculous. This is the case with the learned Gentleman in question. Few writers, perhaps, have been so glaringly inconsistent with themselves as he has been. And the late Mr. Fletcher, vicar of Madely, in Shropshire, hath set his inconsistencies in a very striking point of view, in a small treatise published since his death by Mr. Joseph Benson, entitled, A rational Vindication of the Catholic Faith.

put to death. Not so, however, Nicodemus, Natha-

 niel

I will take the liberty of extracting what he hath said upon this subject for the information and entertainment of the Reader :—" It is " one of the loudest dictates of *reason*," says this truly pious author, " that, as we cannot grasp the universe with our hands, so we cannot comprehend the Maker of the universe with our thoughts.

" Nevertheless, a set of men, who make much ado about *reason*, " after they have candidly acknowledged their ignorance, with regard to the Divine Nature, are so inconsistent as to limit God, " and to insinuate that he can exist only according to their shallow, " dark, and short-sighted ideas. Hence it is, that, if he speak of " his Essence otherwise than they have conceived it to be, they " either reject his revelation, or so wrest and distort it, as to force it " to speak their preconceived notions; in direct opposition to the " plain meaning of the words, to the general tenor of the scriptures, to the consent of the catholic church in all ages, and to " the very form of their own baptism.

" Is not the learned Dr. Priestley a striking instance of this unphilosophical conduct? Great philosopher in natural things, does " he not forget himself in things divine? Candid Reader, to your " unprejudiced reason we make our appeal. With a wisdom worthy of a Christian sage, he speaks thus, in his Disquisitions on " Matter and Spirit : ' Of the *substance of the Deity*, WE HAVE NO ' IDEA AT ALL ; *and, therefore, all that we can conceive*, OR PRONOUNCE, *concerning it, must be* MERELY HYPOTHETICAL : p. ' 109, 110.—But has he behaved consistently with this reasonable " acknowledgement? And may we not, upon his just concession, " raise the following query?

" When a Doctor has granted that *we have no idea at all of the* " *Divine Substance*, &c. is he not both inconsistent and unreasonable, if, so far from *pronouncing hypothetically* concerning it, he absolutely declares, that the Divine Substance, of which he has NO " IDEA AT ALL, is incompatible with the three Divine Subsistences, which the scripture calls *the Father, the Word, and the Holy* " *Ghost?*

" But Dr. Priestley, after having granted the former proposition " in his Disquisitions, *absolutely pronounces* the latter in his Corruptions of Christianity. Is not, therefore, Dr. Priestley both inconsistent and unreasonable?——

" The learned Doctor, continuing to speak as a true philosopher, " says, ' We know there must be a first Cause, because things do ' actually exist, and could never have existed without a Cause, ' and all secondary Causes necessarily lead us to a primary one. ' But *of the nature of the existence* of this primary Cause *concerning* ' *which we* KNOW NOTHING *but by its effects, we cannot have* " ANY CONCEPTION. We are absolutely confounded, bewildered,

niel, Joseph of Arimathea, and other pious Jews; they were

'and lost, when we attempt to speculate concerning it. This 'speculation is attended with INSUPERABLE *difficulties*. Every 'description of the Divine Being in the New Testament gives us 'an idea of something filling and penetrating all things, and there-'fore of NO KNOWN MODE OF EXISTENCE. Disquisitions, p. '111, 146.

"Upon these second concessions, we raise this second argument. "A Doctor, who grants that *we* KNOW NOTHING *of the first Cause* "*but by its effects*, that *we have no conception of its nature*, that *it* "*has* NO KNOWN MODE *of existence*, and that *this speculation is* "*attended with* INSUPERABLE *difficulties*—must have an uncommon "share of assurance, or of inattention, if he pretend to argue the "Catholic Church out of the belief of the Trinity, *because we have* "*no (clear) conception of its nature, because* it *has* NO KNOWN *mode* "*of existence*, and because (in our present state) *the speculation of* "*it is attended with* some INSUPERABLE *difficulties*.

"But Dr. Priestley has made all these fair concessions in his Dis-"quisitions, and yet he pretends to argue us out of our faith in the "Trinity, because *we have no* clear *conception of its nature, &c.* "Hath not, therefore, the Doctor an uncommon share of assurance, "or of inattention?

Continuing to speak like a Christian philosopher, he says, 'In two 'circumstances that we do know, and probably in MANY others, '*of which* WE HAVE NO KNOWLEDGE AT ALL, the human and 'Divine Nature, finite and infinite Intelligence, MOST ESSENTI-'ALLY differ. The first is, that our attention is necessarily confined 'to one thing, whereas he who made, and continually supports all 'things, must equally attend to all things at the same time; which 'is a most astonishing, but necessary attribute of the one supreme 'God, of which we can form NO CONCEPTION, and consequently, 'in this respect, NO FINITE *mind can be compared with the Divine.* 'Again, the Deity not only attends to every thing, but must be ca-'pable of either producing or annihilating any thing: so that, in 'this respect also, *the Divine Nature must be* ESSENTIALLY DIF-'FERENT *from ours*: p. 106.—There is, therefore, upon the whole, 'manifold reason to conclude, that *the Divine Nature or Essence*, '*besides being simply* UNKNOWN TO US, has properties MOST ESSE-'NTIALLY DIFFERENT *from every thing else.* p. 107.—God is, 'and every must remain, THE INCOMPREHENSIBLE.' p. 108.

"Upon this set of unavoidable concessions, made by Dr. P. we "raise this third argument. A philosopher who grants that *God* "*is* THE INCOMPREHENSIBLE—that *the human and Divine Nature* "(of consequence human and Divine Personality) *most essentially* "*differ*—and that *the Divine Essence has properties most essentially* "*different from every thing else:* A Philosopher, I say, who pub-

were sincere, upright, humble men; they patiently examined

" licly grants this, must be one of the most prejudiced of all men, " if he rejects the sacred Trinity, into whose name he was baptized, because the Trinity is in some sense *incomprehensible*, and " because he insists that three *Divine* Persons must be *divided* and " *separated* like three human persons; just as if he did not himself " maintain, that the Divine Essence, or Personality, *hath properties* " *most essentially different from men, angels, and every thing else.*

" We shall produce but one more set of the philosophical concessions, of which Dr. P. loses sight in his theological works.

' In the first place,' says he, 'it must be confessed, with awful ' reverence, that we know but little of ourselves, and therefore ' MUCH LESS of our Maker, even with respect to his attributes. ' We know but little of the *works* of God, and therefore certainly ' MUCH LESS of his *Essence*. In fact, we have NO PROPER IDEA ' of any *essence* whatever. It will hardly be pretended that we have ' ANY PROPER IDEA of the substance even of matter, considered ' as divested of all its properties.'—Disquisitions, p. 103, 104.

" From these last concessions, and from the tenor of Dr. P. " Corruptions, it appears, that men, who confess they *know little of* " *God's works, and less of his Essence*; and who *have not even any* " *proper idea of the essence of* a straw, pretend, nevertheless, to " KNOW CLEARLY what is inconsistent with the Divine Essence; " insomuch, that setting up as reformers of the three creeds, they " try to turn the doctrine of the Trinity out of the church, and the " Lamb of God out of his divine and everlasting throne.

" Now is not this as absurd, as if they said to the Catholics, " We have indeed been all baptized in the name of the God of the " Christians, that is, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and* " *of the Holy Ghost*:—but we new Gnostics, we modern Reformers, " *who know nothing* of the Father's essence, or even of the essence " of an insect—*we* are nevertheless so perfectly acquainted with " the Divine Essence, as to decide, that it is absolutely inconsistent " with the nature of the *Father*, to have a *living Word*, or a *proper* " *Son*, and a *rational Spirit*; and, therefore, reforming our God " himself, we strike *the Word* and *the Holy Ghost* out of the number " of the Divine Persons, whom at our baptism we vowed to serve " jointly forever.

" O ye Philosophers of the age, can men of sense admire your " philosophy, any more than men of faith admire your orthodoxy? " May we not hope, that, when the blunders of your Logic are " brought to light, they will be a proper antidote for the poison of " your errors? And will your admirers be still so inattentive, as not to " see, that your capital objections against the Trinity are sufficiently " answered by applying to them the short reply you make on another occasion, *This is an argument which derives all its force from* " OUR IGNORANCE?"

amined into the nature of his doctrine and pretensions; and they saw and believed. All the rest of the nation, with a few other exceptions, God gave up to judicial blindness and hardness of heart. The consequence was, they rejected him who alone was able to save them. They imprecated his blood upon their own guilty and ill-judging heads; and they died in their sins, under every possible mark of the divine displeasure.[7]

In like manner, we may have abundant evidence, in the word of God, concerning the unity of nature and plurality of persons in the Godhead,[8] and yet through inattention, pride of understanding,[9] affectation of singularity,

[7] For a fuller illustration of this subject I would recommend the Reader to consult Jones on the Trinity, preface, p. 21—31.

[8] The doctrine of the Trinity is "an imperfect discovery, not a "contradiction." See Horsley's Tracts, p. 70.

[9] There is a little pamphlet, said to be written by the Revd. Mr. Jones, author of the Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity, entitled, A Preservative against the Publications dispersed by modern Socinians, which I could wish to be in the hands of every person whose mind is conversant in these speculations. The price is only three pence, and the book may be got from London by any of the booksellers. I don't know that every position in the book is strictly defensible; but upon the whole, I think, it is well suited to counteract the ill tendency of those writings it is designed to oppose. Dr. Priestley has animadverted upon one or two passages in this little work, and shewn the rashness of an assertion, and the weakness of the reasoning in those paragraphs. And in my judgement the Doctor has very justly reproved the author in those particular instances. But then it does not follow, that because he has given a very fair answer to one or two of the weakest arguments in a book, that he has given a satisfactory reply to the more substantial and important parts. In like manner, the Doctor has answered the same Mr. Jones's Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity. He has given us some strictures upon a few of the looser and more feeble conclusions of the book, and then he would make the inattentive reader believe he has subverted the whole. This is a very unfair mode of proceeding. A generous adversary would attack a few, at least, of the strongest positions of his antagonist, and leave the other to fall by their own weight. But this is too much to be expected from polemics. Dr. Randolph complains of the same unfair dealing in Mr. Lindsey. "It is a common artifice of our author," says he, "when he meets

gularity, and their dreadful consequence, judicial blindness, we may reject the evidence, despise, ridicule [1] and sneer at the doctrine, and die in our sins. We should, therefore, be very serious and earnest in our inquiries, and betake ourselves to the word of God with humility and pious zeal. [2] We should lift up our hearts to the fountain of light for that wisdom which is profitable to direct. And we should not only be careful to learn the will of God, but, when we have learnt it, faithfully and honestly practise it: so may we expect, according to a variety of scripture declarations, to be led into all saving truth.

Some modern authors, of considerable name, have attempted to prove, that all the scripture requires in order to our acceptance with God, is, to believe that Jesus is the Meſſiah, and to obey his moral precepts: [3]

But

" with what he thinks a weak argument in an orthodox writer, to lay " hold of that, and pass by all the rest." Vindication, p. 5.

In the same mode of proceeding, it is a very easy matter to answer the most conclusive book that ever was written.

[1] " Obloquy and ridicule seem to be the trials which God hath appointed, instead of persecution, in the present age, to prove the " sincerity and patience of the faithful. The advocate of that " sound form of words, which was originally delivered to the saints, " hath to expect that his opinions will be the open jest of the Unitarian party: that his sincerity will be called in question; or if a " bare possibility of his being in earnest be charitably admitted, the " misfortune of his education will be lamented, and his prejudices " deplored. All this insult will not alarm nor discompose him. " He will rather glory in the recollection, that his adherence to the " faith of the first ages hath provoked it. The conviction, which " he will all the while enjoy, that his philosophy is Plato's, and his " creed St. John's, will alleviate the mortification he might otherwise feel in differing from Dr. Priestley; nor suffer him to think " the evil insupportable, although the consequence of this dissent " should be, that he must share with the excellent Bishop of Worcester, in Dr. Priestley's pity and indignation."

Bishop Horsley's Tracts, p. 72.

[2] " I gratefully receive, and rejoice in the light of Revelation, " which sets me at rest in many things, the manner whereof my poor " reason can by no means make out to me." Lock.

[3] See Priestley's Importance of Free Inquiry, passim.

But there appears to be dangerous fallacy in their reasoning. For, to believe this single proposition, that Jesus is the Messiah, implies a belief also of all that Jesus and his Apostles both did and taught. And we can no more with safety reject their doctrines than their mission. From the truth of their mission we must infer the truth of what they taught. And professedly to reject any part of the latter, is, virtually to reject the former.

Now, it is certain, that, if we credit the writings of the Apostles, we must suppose there are several opinions destructive, as well as absolute infidelity. And, moreover, it very frequently happens, that erroneous principles beget erroneous practices. Impure fountains cannot send forth pellucid streams. From the very infancy of Christianity this observation was strongly exemplified in the various errors that arose among those who were professed believers in Christ Jesus. He was aware of the growth of noxious weeds, and cautioned his followers against them. *Beware of false prophets*, said he, *which come to you in sheeps clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits.* The Apostles likewise frequently do the same. And, according to their predictions, whole shoals of erroneous opinions broke in upon the church, even in its earliest days. "Simon Magus, the first author of "all heresy, fell from the christian faith almost as soon "as he had embraced it. Hymeneus and Philetus de-"nied the resurrection.[4] Others, whom the Apostles "have not pointed out by name in the sacred writings, "maintained the necessity of circumcision, and of observing

Dr. Fiddes very justly observes, that "an assent to that one ar-"ticle (namely that Jesus Christ was the promised Messiah) was, in "effect, and implicitly, an assent to all which that article contained; "the whole Christian religion."

Body of Divinity, vol. 1. page 407.

[4] "The resurrection of the body is what no force of human wis-"dom could have discovered; yet reason tells us it is possible, and

" serving the law of Moses. Others maintained that " Jesus Christ had not come in the flesh; that is, had " not assumed a real body and soul. Others denied Jesus " to be the Christ, or the begotten Son of God; say- " ing that Jesus was a mere man, on whom the Christ " descended when he was baptized by John in the river " Jordan. All these, and their doctrines, are spoken of, " and reprobated by the Apostles in different places of " the New Testament; some are declared to be ac- " cursed; others are called seducers and antichrists; " and of all of them in general, and particularly of the " professors of the two latter heresies, St. John says, " *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if* " *they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued* " *with us: but they went out, that they might be made* " *manifest that they were not all of us.*[5] " 1 Ep. 2. 19. Hence, I think, it appears as clear as any proposition in Euclid, that some doctrines are fundamental, as well as certain practices, and that the belief of them is as necessary to salvation, as obedience to the moral precepts of the gospel. Indeed, without true faith there can be no legitimate practice, any more than an effect without a cause.[6]

" within the power of God to effect it; therefore the understanding " may fully assent to it, without knowing the bounds of Omnipo- " tence, or in what manner he will accomplish and bring it to pass."
Ellis's Knowledge of Divine Things. p. 261.

[5] See the Revd. James Barnard's Letters to Dr. Priestley, preface, page 1 and 2.

[6] Irenæus was a learned and pious bishop in the second century, and wrote five books upon the heresies which had prevailed from the origin of Christianity to his own times. I have often thought, that we should be extremely careful how we admit or deny any religious principles which he receives not or admits. Now, it is very certain, that he ranks the Ebionites among the heretics of former times, and therefore, were he living now, he would consider the Socinians in the same light; for they are in the present day, what the Ebionites were of old. Dr. Priestley, indeed, gets over this difficulty with the greatest ease imaginable, as he does over every other. Difficulties insuperable to others are none to him. Mountains shall be

One great objection which I have long had to the principles of our modern Socinians,[7] is, that they marvellously

plains, or plains shall be mountains, as suits his convenience. Facts, however, are stubborn things. And if Irenæus does really rank the Ebionites in his catalogue of heretics, Dr. Priestley's denying it, or setting light by his judgment, will be of little avail. Let the Reader then judge what the good old Bishop and glorious Martyr's opinion was, from the extracts he will find out of his writings in a subsequent part of this work.

[7] The Socinians frequently make their boast of Dr. Clarke, as though he were a favourer of their scheme; whereas it is well known, that he was no friend to their degrading doctrines. He held both the reality of the Trinity and the Atonement, though not exactly in the orthodox sense. And speaking of our modern Ebionites he says:—"The Socinian writers have *very unreasonably* presumed to "collect, that our Saviour was no greater a person than a mere "man born of the virgin Mary without any former existence, and "exalted by the power of God to this state of dignity in heaven. "But this their inference, I say, *is very unreasonable*; for though "the derivation of our Lord's power from the Father, must and "ought to be acknowledged; that all men's confessing Jesus to be "Lord may be *to the glory of God the Father*; yet from those other "texts of scripture, wherein it is affirmed, that *by Christ God created "all things*; that he was *in the form of God*, before he appeared in "*the form of a servant*; that he *was with God*, and *had glory with "God before the world was*; from these texts, I say, it undeniably "appears, that our Lord's having all power given him both in hea-"ven and earth, cannot signify the original exaltation of one who "had no being before he was born of the Virgin; but the exaltation "of him into the form of God, who voluntarily emptied himself of "that glory he had before, and with unparalleled humility took "upon himself the form of a servant, and suffered in that form for "our sakes, and therefore was *worthy to receive power and riches "and wisdom and strength and honour and glory and blessing*, because "he *was slain, and redeemed us to God by his own blood, out of every "tongue and kindred and people and nation.*"*

Grotius too is frequently mentioned as a great champion for the Socinian cause; but without any just reason: for both in his Catechism and Poems, as well as in his Comment on the first chapter of St. John, he declares his faith in the Holy Trinity, in as ample a manner as any man can reasonably desire. Let the Reader consult his own writings, especially the three places just mentioned, and Stillingfleet on the Trinity pages 137—143, where he is sufficiently vindicated from the charge of Socinianism.

Sir Isaac Newton is likewise oftentimes named as a favourer of

* Rev. 5. 9, 12. Clarke's Sermons, vol. 6. p. 59.

vellously debase the Christian scheme. [8] The salvation of man is constantly represented in holy scripture as something extremely important, and the means for procuring that salvation as being equally so. All the Patriarchs and Prophets, with the whole Jewish oeconomy of types and shadows were preparatory to the Messiah's advent; and all the angels in heaven administered to the great design, lost in astonishment at the Divine proceedings. This apparatus appears to me by far too splendid and magnificent, if our blessed Saviour

the same scheme; for no other reason, I suppose, but because he wrote against the authenticity of the famous verse in the first Epistle of St. John. We are informed, however, in the Critical Review for September 1790, on the Religious Sentiments of Laymen, that "the Arians and Socinians have each claimed Sir Isaac as their "own; but Whiston has told us," continues the Reviewer, "that "Sir Isaac was irreconcilably angry with him because he said that "he was an Arian."

Mr. Whitaker in his Origin of Arianism controverts this opinion. See p. 458. See also Historical Memoirs of Religious Dissension, p. 34.—The same Mr. Whitaker attempts to prove that the above Dr. Samuel Clarke died in the sound and orthodox faith, p. 456—470.

Milton, Watts, and Lock have sometimes been claimed as patrons of Socinianism; but without any just foundation. Indeed, those who can rank St. John and St. Paul in that degrading list, will have little difficulty in claiming any other writers whom they may think an honour to their opinions. For a vindication of Milton from the charge of Socinianism, see Burgh's Sequel, p. 262—266. For a vindication of Watts, see the Revd. Samuel Palmer's account of his last sentiments on the Trinity in Dr. Johnson's Life of Watts, with Notes, p. 42—112. And for a vindication of Lock, see his own Second Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity, p. 668, where he tells us, "that it is very hard for a Christian, who reads "the scripture with attention, and an unprejudiced mind, to deny "the *satisfaction of Christ*;" a position utterly inconsistent with every idea of Socinianism.

[8] "Socinianism cuts to the very root of all that is distinguishing in "the gospel. It destroys the necessity, and even the importance "of a miraculous interposition, and gives the infidel too great rea-"son to exclaim, that all that was extraordinary was superfluous; "and that the apparatus was too expensive and too splendid for the "purposes to which it was applied." Professor White's Notes to his excellent Sermons, p. 68.

were nothing more than a mere man.' All the infinite glory

' Dr. Clarke has given us the following compendious view of the Son, Holy Ghost, and blessed Trinity. How utterly inconsistent it is with every idea of Socinianism the Reader will easily judge.

I. OF THE SON.

" He knows men's thoughts.
" He knows things distant.
" He knows all things.
" He is the judge of all.
" It would have been a condescension in him to take upon him " the nature of angels.
" He knows the Father, even as he is known of the Father.
" He so reveals the Father, as that he who knows him, knows " the Father.
" He takes away the sin of the world.
" He forgave sins, and called God his *own* Father.
" All things are his.
" He is Lord of all.
" He is Lord of glory.
" He appeared of old in the person of the Father.
" He is greater than the temple.
" He is the same forever.
" He hath the keys of hell and of death.
" He hath the seven spirits of God.
" He is the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end.
" He is the prince of life.
" He and his Father are one.
" He is in the Father and the Father in him.
" He is the power and wisdom of God.
" He is holy and true.
" He is in the midst of them who meet in his name.
" He will be with them always, even unto the end.
" He will work with them and assist them.
" He will give them a mouth and wisdom.
" He will give them what they ask in his name.
" He hath life in himself.
" He hath power to raise up himself.
" He will raise up his disciples.
" He works as the Father works, and does all as he doth.
" He has all power in heaven and in earth.
" He is above all.
" He sits on the throne, and at the right hand of God.
" He was before Abraham.
" He was in the beginning with God.
" He had glory with God before the world was.
" He was in the form of God.

glory of the gospel scheme vanishes; the scriptures, which I used to consider as the word of God, and replete with wisdom worthy of their Author, lose their majesty,

" He came down from heaven, and is in heaven.
" He is the head under whom all things are reconciled to God.
" In him dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead.
" He is the image of God.
" He is in the bosom of the Father.
" His generation none can declare.
" He is the word of God.
" He is the Son of God.
" He is the only-begotten Son of God.
" He is the first-born of every creature.
" Other scriptures speak thus :—
" The kingdom of Christ and of God.
" The throne of God and of the Lamb.
" The wrath of God and of the Lamb.
" The first-fruits to God and to the Lamb.
" God and the Lamb the light of the new Jerusalem.
" God and the Lamb the temple of it.†

II. OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

" He is the immediate author and worker of all miracles.
" He is the conducter of Christ in all the actions of his life
" here upon earth.
" He is the inspirer of the prophets and apostles.
" He is the sanctifier of all hearts, and the supporter and com-
" forter of Christians under all their difficulties.
" Blasphemy against him is unpardonable.
" He is eternal.
" He is the power of the Highest.
" He is the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father,
" and which the world cannot receive.
" To lie unto him is the same as to lie unto God.
" To resist him is the same as to resist God.
" He gave injunctions to the church.
" He is the Spirit of glory and of God.
" He knows the mind of God, as perfectly as a man knows his
" own mind.
" Men's bodies by being temples of the Spirit are temples of
" God.

† Let the Reader compare the above characters of our blessed Saviour with that curious declaration of Dr. Priestley, where he says, " As to the Divinity of Christ, " an ingenious man would easily find as many plausible arguments for the divinity " of Moses," and then judge how little dependence is to be placed on the confident assertions of this over-zealous and misguided man.

majesty, and seem calculated rather to mislead than inform. I conclude, therefore, that the principles of Socinus

" He is the author of liberty and knowledge.
" He reveals things which even the angels desire to look into.
" He raiseth the dead.
" We are to baptize in his name.
" To wish grace and peace and blessing from him.
" To appeal to him as witness in solemn affirmations.
" To take heed not to resist him.
———" not to do despite to him.
———" not to tempt him.
———" not to grieve him.

III. THE HOLY TRINITY.

The three persons are stiled,

" Once. *He which is and which was, and which is to come: the " seven Spirits which are before his throne: and " Jesus Christ, the faithful witness.*
" Once. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.
" Once. The Father, the Son, and the Spirit.
" Once. The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.
" Twice. The Father, Jesus, the Spirit.
" Twice. The Father, Jesus, the Holy Ghost.
" Once. The Father, Christ, the Spirit,
" Once. The Father, Jesus Christ, the Spirit.
" Once. The Father, the Lord, the Spirit.
" Once. God the Father, Jesus Christ, the Spirit.
" Once. He that raised up Jesus from the dead, Jesus, the Spirit.
" Once. The living God, Christ, the Spirit.
" Once. The living God, Christ, the eternal Spirit.
" Four times. God, Jesus, the Spirit.
" Once. God, the Son of God, the Holy Ghost.
" Five times. God, Jesus, the Holy Ghost.
" Once. God, Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Spirit of holiness.
" Once. God, Christ, the Holy Ghost.
" Five times. God, Christ, the Spirit.
" Four times. God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost.
" Five times. God, Jesus Christ, the Spirit.
" Four times. God, the Lord, the Spirit.
" Twice. God, his Son, the Spirit.
" Once. God, the Lord, the Holy Ghost.
" Once. God, Christ, the eternal Spirit."

Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, passim.

cinus and his followers are false and dangerous, and highly unworthy the espousal of men, who are concerned for the honour of God, and the advancement of true religion. [1]

But the grand objection to the doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, is, the seeming absurdity and contradiction of the thing, that three shall be one, and one three. Now

[1] " All the mysteries of the New Testament are pure and noble, " august and becoming the majesty of the God of gods. The ve- " nerable mysteries of the incarnation, the sacred Trinity, the resur- " rection and glorification of human bodies, are not vain speculations " to amuse the fancy; but are the essential doctrines and fundamen- " tals of the purest religion in the world; that are graciously de- " signed and directly tend to improve the understanding, and rectify " the will, to raise gratitude, and all duty and devout affections to " God. They have a certain and full influence on the present and " future happiness of mankind. It is observable that in the Epistles " that treat most fully and magnificently of the sublime doctrines " and awful objects of our faith, there is always in the conclusion " a choice collection of morals and sound precepts of pure life; " which are the true consequences of those most lofty and venerable " truths and essentials of the Christian creed.

" Those awful and venerable secrets, which *the angels desire to look* " *into*, are by free-thinkers, and profane pretenders to philosophy, " made to be no secrets at all; and so the majesty of the thoughts " of the sacred writers, and the propriety and nobleness of their lan- " guage are debased, and, comparatively, sunk into meanness and " contempt. The goodness of God the Father, and the condescen- " sion of our Saviour in redeeming the human race, are depretiated, " and infinitely undervalued; and by consequence the obligations of " mankind to love, obedience, and gratitude for infinite mercies are " horridly weakened and lessened. Ill principles and heretical de- " pravations of the gospel mysteries naturally tend to vice and cor- " ruption of manners. But if Jesus Christ, according to the plain " language, the whole contexture and design of the sacred books, " be true, natural, eternal God, without any quibble or evasion, then " how adorable is the love of God the Father, who spared not his " own Son for our salvation? How infinitely great and obligatory the " condescension of God the Son, who took our nature and suffered for " us? How stupendous the charity and grace of God the Holy Ghost, " who inspires Christians with a due sense of this great salvation? " and with qualifications to entitle us to it, and make us capable, " fully and with eternal satisfaction to enjoy it?"

Blackwall's Sacred Classics, v. 1. p. 320.

Now, this may be either true or false, absurd or otherwise, according as it is explained and understood. If we said, that three are one, and one three, exactly in the same sense, the thing is not only absurd, but impossible; it is a contradiction. But to say, the Divine Being is only one in essence and three in person; that he is three in one respect, and only one in another respect, is no absurdity, no contradiction; but may be an eternal truth, founded in the nature of things. And if this were well considered, there would be an end to all opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity, from the seeming absurdity of the thing. It is confessed on all hands, that the doctrine is abstruse and incomprehensible. So is the doctrine of the Divine Nature, upon any hypothesis whatever. Yet we do not say, it is absurd. We are obliged to submit our understandings, and silently acquiese and adore. So with respect to the three persons, *who bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost*, the scripture assures us they *are one.*[2] And as reason as well as scripture assures us, there can be but one God, we therefore conclude, these three persons are partakers of one common essence. Though they are three in one respect, yet they are only one in another.

This will not appear so strange, perhaps, if we consider, that there are several objects in nature, besides the Divine Being, which are three and one; not three and one in the same respect, but three in one respect, and only one in another. This may render the doctrine of the Trinity more easy of comprehension; at least, make it appear not so absurd as sometimes it is represented by rash and inconsiderate mortals. Illustrations, indeed, not do prove the truth of any doctrine; they only render it more easy of admittance into our minds and belief, when we see other objects, with which we are well acquainted, under similar circumstances. Let

[2] The authenticity of this verse is questioned by some persons of the utmost respectability for their literary attainments. Sub judice lis est.

Let us then look round us, and examine if there be any objects in nature, which are strictly one in essence and yet three in properties. What think we of the Sun? It is certainly one of the most lively images in nature of the Holy and Undivided Trinity.[3] It is one in essence, and is the great fountain and source of both light and heat to the world. As it is the fountain and source of all its properties, it may be considered as representing the eternal Father, who is the fountain of the Deity, and the great original of all Being. The light which issues from the sun, may be considered as representing the second person in the Divine Nature; for our Saviour is called *the sun of righteousness*, and *the light of the world:* and the heat proceeding from the sun, and which accompanies the light, may be considered as representing the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Divine Nature, who proceeds both from the Father and the Son, and gives life to the world. The light and heat both proceed from the sun. Unless the sun existed, there could not be either one or the other. And on the other hand, if there is a sun in the firmament, there must be both light and heat: for it is of the very nature of that vast body to produce these two properties. So that the sun, light, and heat, are coexistent, they cannot be divided. As long as there is a sun there must be its essential properties. The sun, indeed, is not the light, neither the heat, but it is the cause and source of both. They are all distinct, yet undivided. The sun depends not upon the light, or heat, or both, for its existence; but yet it cannot be without them; they are, as we said before, its

[3] The excellent Grotius has given us the same illustration of the doctrine of the Trinity in his Institutio Baptizatorum Puerorum. The translation runs thus:—

" Why is one God set forth in persons three?
" In holy writ thus known is he.
" That *three* are *one*, what reason can us teach?
" God is above all human reach.
" Can it by no similitude be shewn?
" The *sun*, *light*, *heat*, are *three* yet *one*."

essential properties; and if it could be supposed to lose those properties, it would cease to be a sun.[4]

Now, apply all this, not by way of proof, but by way of illustration; by way of aiding our conceptions of the Divine Being, and we shall find there is a wonderful similitude. The Father is the fountain of the Godhead. The Son and Holy Spirit spring from him, and depend upon him. He depends not upon them, but they upon him. He springs not from them, but they derive their being from him. If it could be supposed the Father were annihilated, the Son and Spirit could no longer exist, they would be annihilated likewise. But as the Father is independent of the Son and Spirit, and they are absolutely dependent upon him, as the fountain of the Deity, so neither can he be without them. They naturally and essentially proceed from him, as the light and heat naturally and essentially proceed from the sun. The Father cannot be without the Son and Spirit, any more than the sun can be without its essential properties. The Father was everlastingly a Father, the Son everlastingly a Son, and the Holy Ghost everlastingly a proceeding Spirit. So that though the Father is the fountain of the Deity, yet all the three are undivided, inseparable, coequal and coeternal together.

Take another illustration of this mysterious and incomprehensible

[4] "The several similitudes which the ancients used to illustrate this matter, manifestly shew, that they never dreamed of the Son's being created. Those similitudes are all of them low, and infinitely short of what they are intended to represent. Some of them perhaps are too coarse, and such as might better have been spared. But writers are not always upon their guard. They had a pious design in adapting their comparisons to the very meanest capacities.——The comparisons of fountain and stream, root and branch, body and effluvia, light and light, fire and flame, &c. served more particularly to signify the consubstantiality. Those of mind and thought, light and splendor, were more particularly calculated to denote coeternity, abstracting from the consideration of consubstantiality."

Waterland's first and second Defences, passim.

comprehensible doctrine.[5] It is said, when God created man he made him in his own image and likeness. And from the history of creation it is pretty clear, that each of the eternal Three was concerned in that great undertaking. May not something more then be meant than is usually supposed, when God said, *Let* us *make man in* OUR *image, after* OUR *likeness?* As the Holy Trinity was engaged in the creation of our natures, may we not from these expressions expect to find a lively representation of that Trinity in those natures?

Whether it was designed or not, it is certain there is a striking illustration of the doctrine of the Trinity both in our souls and bodies. I say illustration, because there cannot be an exact resemblance.

The body, for instance, consists of length, breadth, and thickness. These three properties are all essential to matter. We cannot destroy one without destroying the whole: nor can we by any means make its essential properties either more or less. Here then, as well as

[5] The pious Dr. Henry Moore, in his Divine Dialogues, endeavours to enter into the philosophy of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. I pretend not to determine whether the view that he gives of it is proper or otherwise; but he there says:—"That God might enjoy a most happy and perfect life, it is necessary that he should have a companion equal to himself, and a proper witness and congratulator of his own perfections: which, since he cannot otherwise have, unless we will suppose God to be really imperfect, he must beget of himself; whom we Christians call his only-begotten Son, who is the eternal witness, congratulator, and heir of his Father's perfections. Observe, and take the matter right. The Divine nature is such, according to the very idea of God, who is a Being absolutely perfect, that it could not but beget this noble and divine Son of itself, any more than it could not exist of itself, or, that existing, not be most happy."

He speaks thus of the Holy Spirit:—"As the Father by a reflex conception in himself begot the Son or eternal Logos, so this Logos by the congratulatory contemplation of the Father's perfections, that he might not seem steril or fruitless, made this living Essence to spring in himself, which we commonly call the Holy Ghost, or Divine Essential Love."—See his reasoning at large, Supplement to 3. Dialogue, p. 536.

in the sun are three and one. Not three and one in the same respect, for that, as was before observed, would be a contradiction; but three properties and one essence, and this is no contradiction.

The soul of man likewise is another lively image of the unity of nature and plurality of persons in the Deity: for it consists of three essential faculties; the understanding, the memory, and the will.[6] The understanding

[6] Grotius represents the powers of the mind nearly in the same manner:—

"May we not some such thing in mankind see?
"*Life, reason, will*, in one are three.
"Are Father, Son, and Spirit equal? they
"With equal might one sceptre sway?"

Dr. Francis Gregory in his Divine Antidote, speaking upon the difficulty of comprehending the doctrine of the Trinity, says, "The "resurrection of the dead is a doctrine attended with such intrica- "cies, and so many difficulties, that human reason scarce knoweth "how to admit it for a certain truth, though, indeed, it be so. "In St. Paul's time it was thought to be a thing incredible, and "Celsus stiles it in Origen a thing impossible, and yet we believe, "not only that it may, but must be. Now, as there are some things "in nature, which are looked upon as types, emblems, and represen- "tations of the resurrection; so likewise are there some instances "in nature, which, though they cannot be urged as proofs for the "certainty, yet may serve as useful illustrations to help our weak "apprehensions, and somewhat facilitate our belief, as to the possi- "bility of the Trinity. As for instance: There is in every living "man a *rational*, a *sensitive*, and a *vegetive* soul; and yet the soul "of man is but one: so here, there is in the Deity a Father, a Son, "and an Holy Ghost, and yet the Deity is but one. Only here is "the difference, *reason, sense*, and *vegetation*, are but three essential "and distinct faculties, or powers of one and the same soul: where- "as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are three essential and distinct "subsistences in one and the same Godhead; and for the belief of "this, the scripture is our only authentic warrant."——Page 248.

Tertullian illustrates the procession of the Son from the Father by several comparisons, which serve, indeed, to convey some light into the subject, but yet fall infinitely short of a just and adequate representation:—"The Word," says he, "was always in the Father, as "he saith, *I am in the Father*. John 14. 10. And the Word was "always with God, as it is written, *And the Word was with God*. "John 1. 30. and never was separated from the Father, or another

ing may be considered as the leading, father faculty, the memory and the will as dependent. They are all equally necessary to the existence of a human soul, but yet absolutely distinct. The understanding is not the memory, neither the memory the will; nor is the will either the understanding or the memory. Without the understanding there can be no memory, and without both there can be no will, nor can either the memory or the will exist without first supposing the understanding. So the soul of man, every whit as well as the Holy Trinity, may be called one in three and three in one, all coequal and coessential. Destroy one and you destroy the whole.

These

" from the Father, because *I and the Father are one.* John 10. 30. " This assertion will be a defence of the truth, the guardian of the " Unity, by which we declare the Son to be deduced from the Father, but not separated. For as even the Paraclete teacheth, God " put forth his Word as a root puts forth the stem, and a fountain " the river, and the sun a ray; for these several species are the " extensions of the substances from which they proceed. Nor " should I scruple to call the fruit the son of the root, a river the " son of the fountain, and a ray the son of the sun; because every " origin is a parent; and every thing which is brought forth from " an origin is a progeny: much more the Word of God who hath " even with propriety received the name of the Son. Yet neither " is the fruit sundered from the root, nor the river from the fountain, nor the ray from the sun, so neither the Word from God. " Therefore according to the manner of these examples I profess " that I call God and his Word, the Father and his Son, two. For " both the root and stem are two things, but conjoined; and the " fountain and river are specifically two things, but not divided; and " the sun and ray are two forms, but cohering together. It is ne- " cessary, that whatsoever proceeds shall be second to that from " which it proceeds, but not that it shall be therefore separate. But " where there is a second, there are two; and where there is a third, " there are three. But the Spirit is third from God, and the Son, " as the fruit from the stem is a third from the root, and a stream " from a river a third from the fountain, and a gleam from the ray " a third from the sun. There is yet no alienation from the radical " source from which it deduces its peculiarities. So the Trinity, " running down from the Father by compacted and connected de- " grees, in no wise opposes the monarchy, while it supports the " state of the dispensation." Adv. Prax. cap. 8.

These two illustrations, from the soul and body of man, are pursued more at large by the late Mr. Charles Leslie in his Socinian Controversy discussed; a work which every man should read carefully, and either answer, or think himself capable of answering, before he rejects the doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity. I confess, however, that, in my judgment, no man ever did, or ever can *fairly* answer what this gentleman has written upon that subject. A man of learning and ingenuity may cavil with such a writer, and treat him with ridicule and contempt; he may possibly overturn some of his weaker positions; but he can no more give him a fair, solid answer, such as ought to satisfy a reasonable man, competent to judge, than he can prove that two and two do not make four. Mr. Hammon can prove there is no God—Voltaire and Paine can prove that the bible is all a lie—Dr. Priestley that Jesus Christ was a *mere* man, and St. Paul an inconclusive reasoner—but how? by what arguments?

The same Mr. Leslie hath given us a summary of his reasoning upon the doctrine of the Trinity in a letter to Mr. Gildon, the celebrated Deist, who had been converted to Christianity by reading that Gentleman's book entitled, A Short Method with the Deists: and as it may afford satisfaction to some persons, who might not otherwise have an opportunity of seeing it, I will transcribe the substance of it in this place:—"We must "acknowledge," says this great man, "that there are "many things in the Divine Nature far out of the "reach of our reason: for how can finite comprehend "infinite? Who can think what eternity is? a duration "without beginning, or succession of parts or time! "Who can so much as imagine or frame any idea of "a Being neither made by itself, nor by any other! of "omnipresence! of a boundless immensity!

"Yet all this reason obliges us to allow, as the ne-"cessary consequences of a first cause.

"And where any thing is established upon the full

"proof

" proof of reason, there ten thousand objections or dif-
" ficulties, though we cannot answer them, are of no
" force at all to overthrow it. Nothing can do that,
" but to refute those reasons upon which it is established.
" Till then, the truth and certainty of the thing remains
" unshaken, though we cannot explain it, nor solve the
" difficulties that arise from it.

" And if it is so upon the point of reason, much
" more upon that of revelation, where the subject mat-
" ter is above our reason, and could never have been
" found out by it.

" All to be done in that case, is, to satisfy ourselves
" of the truth of the fact, that such things were reveal-
" ed of God, and are no imposture.

" And as to the contradiction alledged of three be-
" ing one, it is no contradiction, unless it be said, that
" three are one in the self-same respect: for in divers
" respects, there is no sort of difficulty, that one may
" be three, or three thousand; as one army may con-
" sist of many thousands, and yet it is but one army.
" There is but one human nature, and yet there are
" multitudes of persons who partake of that nature.

" Now, it is not said, that the three persons in the
" Divine Nature are one person; that would be a con-
" tradiction: but it is said, that the three persons are
" one in nature. They are not three and one in the
" same respect; they are three as to persons, and one
" as to nature. Here is no contradiction.

" Again; that may be a contradiction in one nature,
" which is not so in another: for example; It is a con-
" tradiction, that a man can go two yards or miles
" as soon as one, because two is one, and another
" one, yet this is no contradiction to sight, which can
" reach a star as soon as the top of the chimney, and the
" sun darts his rays in a few moments from heaven to
" earth. But more than all these is the motion of
" thought, to which no distance of place is any interrup-
" tion, which can arrive at Japan as soon as at a yard's

" distance;

" distance; and can run into the immensity of possibi-
" lities.

" Now, there are no words possible, whereby to
" give any notion or idea of sight or light to a man
" born blind; and consequently to reconcile the pro-
" gress of sight or light to him from being an absolute
" contradiction; because he can measure it no other-
" wise than according to the motion of legs or arms,
" for he knows no other: therefore we cannot charge
" that as a contradiction in the Incomprehensible Na-
" ture, of being three and one, though we found it to be
" so in our nature; which we do not, because, as before
" said, they are not three and one in the same respect.

" Now, let us consider further, that though there is
" no comparison betwixt finite and infinite, yet we
" have nearer resemblances of the three and one in
" God, than there is of sight to a man born blind: for
" there is nothing in any of the other four senses that
" has any resemblance at all to that of seeing, or that
" can give such a man any notion whatever of it.

" But we find in our own nature, which is said to be
" made after the image of God, a very near resemblance
" of this holy Trinity, and of the different operations of
" each of the Divine Persons.

" For example; To know a thing present, and to
" remember what is past, and to love or hate, are dif-
" ferent operations of our mind, and performed by
" different faculties of it. Of these, the understanding
" is the father faculty, and gives being to things, as to
" us; for what we know not, is to us as if it were not.
" This answers to creation. From this faculty pro-
" ceeds the second, that of memory, which is a pre-
" serving of what the understanding has created to us.
" Then the third faculty is that of the will, which loves
" or hates, and proceeds from both the other; for we
" cannot love or hate what is not first created by the
" understanding, and preserved to us by the memory.

" And though these are different faculties, and their
operations

" operations different; that the second proceeds from " the first, or is begotten by it; and the third proceeds " from the first and second in conjunction, so that one is " before the other, in order of nature, yet not in time; " for they are all congenial, and one is as soon in the " soul as the other: and yet they make not three " souls, but one soul: and though their operations " are different, and the one proceeds from the other, yet " no one can act without the other, and they all con- " cur to every act of each; for in understanding and " remembering there is a concurrent act of the will, " to consent to such understanding or remembering; " so that no one can act without the other; in which " sense, no one is before or after the other; nor can " any of them be or exist without the other.

" But what we call faculties in the soul, we call per- " sons in the Godhead; because there are personal " actions attributed to each of them; as that of sending, " and being sent, to take flesh, to be born, and the " like.

" And we have no other word whereby to express " it. We speak it after the manner of men; nor could " we understand, if we heard any of those unspeakable " words which express the Divine Nature in its proper " essence; therefore we must make allowances, and " great ones, when we apply words of our nature to the " Infinite and Eternal Being. We must not argue " strictly and philosophically from them, more than " from God's being said to repent, to be angry, and the " like. They are words in condescension to our weak " capacities; and without which, we could not under- " stand.

" But this I say, that there are nearer resemblances " afforded to us of this ineffable mystery of the Holy " Trinity, than there is between one of our outward " senses and another; than there is to a blind man of " colours, or of the motion of light or sight. And " a contradiction in the one will not infer a contradiction

" in the other; though it is impossible to be solved,
" as in the instance before given of a man born blind,
" till we come to know both natures distinctly.

" And if we had not the experience of the different
" faculties of the mind, the contradiction would appear
" irreconcilable to all our philosophy, how three could
" be one, each distinct from the other, yet but one soul:
" one proceeding from, or being begot by the other;
" and yet all coeval, and none before or after the other.
" And as to the difference between faculties and persons,
" substance and subsistance, it is a puzzling piece of
" philosophy. And though we give not a distinct sub-
" sistence to a faculty, it has an existence; and one fa-
" culty can no more be another, than one person can
" be another. So that the case seems to be alike in
" both, as to what concerns our present difficulty of
" three and one: besides what before is said, that by
" the word person, when applied to God, for want of
" a proper word whereby to express it, we must mean
" something infinitely different from personality among
" men. And therefore from a contradiction in the one,
" suppose it granted, we cannot charge a contradiction
" in the other, unless we understand it as well as the
" other: for how else can we draw the parallel?

" What a vain thing is our philosophy, when we
" would measure the Incomprehensible Nature by it?
" when we find it nonplust in our own nature, and that
" in many instances? If I am all in one room, is it not
" a contradiction that any part of me should be in ano-
" ther room? Yet it was a common saying among phi-
" losophers, that the soul is all in all, and all in every part
" of the body. How is the same individual soul pre-
" sent at one and the same time, to actuate the distant
" members of the body, without either multiplication
" or division of the soul? Is there any thing in body
" can bear any resemblance to this, without a manifest
" contradiction? Nay, even as to bodies, is any thing
" more a self-evident principle, than that the cause must

" be

" be before the effect? Yet the light and heat of the " sun are as old as the sun: and supposing the sun to " be eternal, they would be as eternal.

" And as light and heat are of the nature of the " sun, and as the three faculties, before mentioned, are " of the nature of the soul, so that the soul could not " be a soul, if it wanted any of them; so may we, " from small things to great, apprehend without any " contradiction, that the three persons are of the very " nature and essence of the Deity, and so of the same " substance with it; and though one proceeding from " the other, as the faculties of the soul do, yet that all " three are consubstantial, coeternal, and of necessary " existence as God is; for that these three are God; " and God is these three; as understanding, memory, " and a will are a soul; and a soul is understanding, " memory, and will. [7]

An unanswerable argument for the divinity of Christ, as it appears to me, may be taken from the doctrine of atonement. Various parts of holy scripture are full of it. And, indeed, without it the bible would be one of the most strange and unaccountable books in the world. But, if Christ were no more than a mere man, this doctrine becomes impossible in the na-

[7] Leslie to Gildon.

Dr. Cheyne seems to have had nearly the same views of this profound subject when he said—" It is impossible the Son should be " without the Father, or the Father without the Son, or both without " the Holy Ghost. It is impossible the Son should not necessarily " and eternally be begotten of the Father, or that the Holy Ghost " should not necessarily and eternally proceed from both."

Philosophical Principles of Religion, p. 82.

Lord Bacon too appears to have had the same views when he professed—" I believe that nothing is without beginning but God; " no nature, no matter, no spirit, but one only, and the same God. " That God, as he is eternally almighty, only wise, only good in his " nature; so he is eternally Father, Son, and Spirit, in persons."

Confession of Faith.

The same ideas concerning the Divine Nature are entertained by M. Malbranche in his Treatise of Morality, part 2. chap. 5.

ture of the thing. I conclude, therefore, that our blessed Saviour is possesed of a nature equal to this undertaking, or, in other words, that he is *God over all blessed forever.* Amen.

" This doctrine of *satisfaction* is the foundation of " the Christian religion; that when man had sinned, " and was utterly unable to make any satisfaction for his " sin, God sent his own Son to take upon him our " flesh, and, in the same nature that offended, to make " full satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, by his " perfect obedience, and the sacrifice of himself upon " the cross.

" Some say, What need any satisfaction? Might not " God forgive without it? It would shew greater mer- " cy. But these men consider not, that God is not only " just, but he is justice itself, justice in the abstract, " he is essential justice. And justice, by its nature, " must exact to the utmost farthing; else it were not " justice. To remit is mercy, it is not justice. And " the attributes of God must not fight and oppose " each other: they must all stand infinite and com- " plete. You may say, then, How can God for- " give at all? How can infinite mercy and justice stand " together?

" This question could never have been answered, if " God himself had not shewed it to us, in the wonder- " ful œconomy of our redemption: for here is his jus- " tice satisfied to the least iota, by the perfect obedi- " ence and passion of Christ, who is God, in the same " human nature that offended. Here is infinite wisdom " expressed in this means found out for our salvation; " and infinite mercy in affording it to us. Thus all his " attributes are satisfied, and filled up to the brim. " They contradict not, but exalt each other. His mer- " cy exalts and magnifies his justice; his justice exalts " his mercy, and both his infinite wisdom.

" This is the sum and substance, the Alpha and Ome- " ga of the Christian religion. Whoever hold not this

" doctrine,

" doctrine, join not with them, nor bid them god-
" speed." [8]

The sum of what the scripture reveals about this great truth, commonly called the *satisfaction* of Christ, may be reduced to these heads.

1. That Adam being made upright sinned against God, and all his posterity in him. Gen. 1. 27;—3. 11;—Eccl. 7. 29;—Rom. 5. 12, 18, 19.

2. That by this sin of our first parents all men are brought into a state of apostacy from, and enmity against God. Gen. 6. 5;—Ps. 51. 5;—Rom. 3. 23;—8. 7;—Ep. 2. 1;—4. 18;—Col. 2. 13.

3. That in this state all men continue in sin against God, and, of themselves, are not able to do otherwise. Rom. 3. 10—12;—7. 15, 18, 19, 23.

4. That the justice and holiness of God, as the moral Governour of the world, require the punishment of sin. Ex. 34. 7;—Jos. 24. 19;—Ps. 5. 4—6; Hab. 1. 13;—Is. 33. 14;—Rom. 1. 32;—3. 5, 6; 2 Thess. 1. 6; Heb. 12. 29.

5. That God hath also engaged his veracity and faithfulness not to leave sin unpunished. Gen. 2. 17;—Deut. 27. 26;—Gal. 3. 10.

6. That God, out of his infinite goodness, grace and love to mankind, sent his only Son to save and deliver them out of this condition. Mat. 1. 21;—John 3. 16, 17;—Rom. 5. 8;—1 John 4. 9, 10;—1 Thess. 1. 10.

7. That the way in general, whereby the Son of God, being incarnate, is to save lost sinners, was by a substitution of himself, in the room of those whom he was to save. 2 Cor. 5. 21;—Gal. 3. 13;—Rom. 5. 7. 8;—8. 3;—1 Pet. 2. 24;—3. 8.

8. This way of saving sinners is expressed in a variety of manners in scripture:

1. He offered himself a sacrifice for sin to God. Is. 53.

[8] Leslie to Gildon.

53. 10;—John 1. 29;—Ep. 5. 2;—Heb. 2. 17;—9. 11—14.

2. He redeemed us by paying a price, a ransom for us. Mark 10. 45;—1 Cor. 6. 20;—1 Tim. 2. 6;—Tit. 2. 14;—1 Pet. 1. 11, 18.

3. He bare our sins, or the punishment due to them. Is. 53. 5, 11;—1 Pet. 2. 24.

4. He answered the law and the penalty of it. Rom. 8. 3;—Gal. 3. 13;—4. 4, 5.

5. He died for sin and sinners, to expiate the one, and instead of the other. Rom. 4. 25;—5. 10;—1 Cor. 15. 3;—2 Cor. 5. 14;—1 Thess. 5. 9, 10.

6. The effect hereof was—1. That the righteousness of God was glorified. Rom. 3. 25, 26.—2. The law fulfilled and satisfied. Rom. 8. 3.—Gal. 3. 13, 14;—4. 5.—3. God reconciled. 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19;—Heb. 2. 17.—4. Atonement was made for sin, an end made of sin, and peace with God obtained. Rom. 5. 11;—Ep. 2. 14.—Dan. 9. 24.[9]

Another argument for the divinity of Christ arises from the absurdity of his being no more than a mere man. All the great things spoken of him in holy scripture seem incongruous to simple humanity. There is an indecorum in the thing, that a mere man should be placed at the head of the universe, and all the beings in it made subject unto him. I submit it to the Reader's consideration, whether there is not something as absurd in this hypothesis, as any thing that can be alledged against the doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, when fairly and candidly explained. One may justly, I think, retort Dr. Priestley's own words, that the hypothesis is, "such as no miracles can prove." The position appears to me so highly improbable as to render the whole scripture where such doctrines are contained infinitely incredible.[1]

Irenæus

[9] See Dr. Owen on the Trinity, p. 108.

[1] "The Socinians have been unlucky in the execution of their "main design: for they have not purged mystery out of the scrip-

Irenæus relates a story,[2] which he had from his master Polycarp, that going with some friends at Ephesus to a bath, and finding Cerinthus,[3] the arch-heretic, there before him, he with great abhorrence turned back, crying out, "Let us escape immediately, lest the building fall upon our heads, since Cerinthus, the enemy of God and his truth is in it." Now, whether this relation be in itself true or false, it incontestably shews us in what abhorrence the principles of Cerinthus were held in the time of Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, and in the time of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John: And, if the story be true, of which there is no solid reason to doubt, we may add, in the time of St. John, the bosom friend and beloved disciple of our Lord.

Another argument for the divinity of Christ arises from his being so strangely joined with his Father in various parts of the holy scripture: I mean in such passages as these:—*Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ*, repeated in most of the epistles of St. Paul:—*James, a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ:*——*Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord:*——*To them who are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.*[4] Now, upon the

"ture, they have only changed its place: they have taken mystery "out of *the doctrine* of the scripture, where it was venerable, and "worthy the majesty of God, and have placed it *in the phrase of* "the scripture, where it is opprobrious and repugnant to God's sin-"cerity."

Young's Sermons, vol. 2. p. 78.

[2] Book 3d. chap. 3d.—[3] "Cerinthus believed that Christ was a "mere man, born of Joseph and Mary, but, in his baptism, a celes-"tial virtue descended on him in form of a dove, by means "whereof he was consecrated by the Holy Spirit, and made Christ." He entertained besides various other errors. See Irenæus for the particulars.

[4] "It is an old and true distinction," says Dean Swift, "that "things may be above our reason, without being contrary to it. "Of this kind are the power, the nature, and the universal presence "of God, with innumerable other points. How little do those, who

the supposition that Christ was no more than a mere good man, exalted by the pleasure of the Father, this seems strange unguarded language. There is an indecency, an impropriety, an unsuitableness in such representations. The scriptures are calculated to mislead and deceive. Let the Reader, however, judge and determine for himself.

Another argument for the divinity of Christ arises from the necessity of the thing: for if he had not been possessed of a divine nature as well as a human, he could not have been a suitable Mediator between God and man. Hence we find several of the most early Fathers of the church reasoning concerning the different natures of the Redeemer in the manner following:— "There is one physician," says the blessed Ignatius, "both fleshly and spiritual, made and not made; God "incarnate; true life in death; both of Mary and of "God; first passsible, then impassible; even Jesus "our Lord. Wherefore let no man deceive you." [s]

"Corruption," says Justin Martyr "being become "natural to us, it was necessary that he, who would save

"quarrel with mysteries, know of the commonest actions of nature? "The growth of an animal, of a plant, or of the smallest seed, is a "mystery to the wisest among men. If an ignorant person were "told that a loadstone would draw iron at a distance, he might say, "it was a thing contrary to his reason, and he could not believe before "he saw it with his eyes.

"The manner whereby the soul and body are united, and how they "are distinguished, is wholly unaccountable to us. We see but one "part, and yet we know we consist of two; and this is a mystery "we cannot comprehend, any more than that of the Trinity.

"God never did command us to believe, nor his ministers to preach "any doctrine which is contrary to the reason he hath been pleased "to endue us with; but, for his own wise ends, has thought fit to "conceal from us the nature of the thing he commands; thereby to "try our faith and obedience, and increase our dependence upon "him."

Sermons, p. 24—26.

See too the late Revd. John Wesley's Sermon on the Trinity, where are some useful reflections.

[s] Epist. to Ephe. sect. 7.

" save us, should destroy that which corrupted us. " This could not otherwise be, except what was na- " turally life was joined to that which was corruptible, " to vanquish corruption, and for the future preserve " that immortal, which was obnoxious to it. It was " therefore necessary, that the Word should be embo- " died, to free us from the death of our natural cor- " ruption." [6]

Irenæus, in his learned work, more than once inculcates the same important doctrine. " Christ," says he, " united man to God. For if man had not conquered " the adversary of man, he had not been lawfully con- " quered. Again, if God had not given salvation, we " could not have firmly obtained it. And if man had " not been united to God, he could not have " been partaker of incorruption. For it behoved the " Mediator of God and men, by a proper familiarity " with both, to bring them to friendship and unani- " mity, to present man to God, and to make known " God to men." [7]

From the nature of the thing, and from these high authorities, and various others that might be produced, [8] it may, therefore, be fairly concluded, that if our blessed Saviour is not both divine and human, strictly speaking, he is inadequate to the business of man's salvation.

Dr. Priestley, in defence of the simple humanity of Christ, dwells much upon the expectations of the Jews in our Saviour's time. They expected a mere man for their Messiah, and therefore Christ is no more than a mere man. Now, taking for granted the supposition is just (and it may be fairly questioned) it will not follow that the objection proves any thing to the point in

[6] Grabe's Specil. vol. 1. cent. 2. p. 172.

[7] Lib. 3. cap. 20.

[8] See. Iren. lib. 3. cap. 21. Tertul. De resur. carn. c. 51, 63, and De carn. Christ. Hippol. cont. Noet. sec. 17. Cyp. De idol. vanit. sect. 6, 7. Novat. De Trinit. c. 16, 18. Lact. lib. 4. c. 13.

hand. Indeed, it proves too much. We should not attend to what the Jews *did* expect so much, as to what they *ought* to *have* expected, according to their own prophetic scriptures. For it is manifest they were ill guides, mistaken in many things, and extremely obstinate in their errors. We may illustrate this by an instance. It is plain from all their history, that they expected a temporal and triumphant Messiah; whereas it is equally plain they ought to have expected a suffering Messiah, their own prophets having clearly foretold his sufferings. *After three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.*[9] —*He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.*[1] The Jews were accordingly often reproved for not expecting a suffering Messiah, and on this account charged with ignorance of the holy scriptures. *O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?*[2] These are the words of our Saviour himself to the two disciples going to Emmaus. And at another time he said to the whole body of disciples: *These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me.— Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day.*[3] St. Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, made the same declaration to his hearers in the sermon recorded by St. Luke: *Those things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.*[4] And in the same manner St. Paul addressed the Jews: *They that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets*

[9] Dan. 9. 26.—[1] Is. 53.—[2] Luke 24. 25, 26.
[3] Ibid. 24. 44, 46.—[4] Acts 3. 18.

prophets which are read every sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.[5] From all these considerations it fully appears, that the arguments against any part of our blessed Saviour's personal or mediatorial character, which are deduced from the ignorance of his countrymen respecting it, are manifestly inconclusive, because it is clear beyond all contradiction that they were unacquainted with his real character. None more positive and secure than they in the justness of their opinions, none more awfully mistaken. This consideration ought most certainly to moderate the confidence of flaming zealots of every description, and incli e them to contend for what they judge to be the truth with fear and trembling.

There is another objection, which is frequently made to the doctrine of the Trinity by men from whom one would expect better things. If we admit the doctrine of the Trinity, say they, why may we not as well admit the doctrine of transubstantiation? for they are both equally absurd.[6]

[5] Ibid. 13. 27.

[6] This objection hath been answered upon many occasions by men every way qualified, and yet it continues to be urged by the enemies of the Trinity as though no notice had ever been taken of it. This is disingenuous. Men that pretend to be lovers of truth should despise such arts. If an objection is really valid, let it be urged with all the force of which it is capable. But if it is answerable, and has been answered very frequently, we should be ashamed to bring it into the field again. Dr. Priestley is one of the first who would despise a man for being guilty of such conduct in his own case; and yet, I am sorry to see, that he continues to repeat in various of his publications the objection before us; when he must know in his conscience, if he thinks seriously upon it, that it is of no force in this argument. The late Mr. Fletcher, before quoted, hath answered the objection with his usual sprightliness; and, I am persuaded, it will gratify the Reader to see it in his own words:—"If the philoso-
"phers," says this good man, "who attack the catholic faith, can-
"not overthrow the doctrine of the Trinity by the arguments they
"draw from their avowed *ignorance* of the Divine Nature, they
"seem determined to make us give up the point, by arguments
"drawn from *fear* and from *shame*. Availing himself of our *dread*
"of Popery, and of our *contempt* for the Popish error of *transub-*

Are they both equally absurd? Do we understand all

" *stantiation*, the learned Doctor loses no opportunity to compare " that *pretended* mystery, that *despicable* absurdity, with the *awful* " mystery of the Trinity—exhorting us to reject them both, as " equally contrary to reason and common sense. Thus, in his Ap- " peal to the Professors of Christianity, speaking of the Divinity of " Christ, he says, ' The prevalence of so impious a doctrine can be ' ascribed to nothing but that mystery of iniquity, which began to ' work in the times of the Apostles themselves.—This, among other ' shocking corruptions of Christianity, grew up with the system of ' Popery. After exalting a man into God, a creature into a creator, ' men made a piece of bread into one also, and then bowed down to, ' and worshipped the work of their own hands. " And, in the Preface " of his Disquisitions, he writes," ' Most Protestants will avow they ' have *made up their minds* with respect to the Popish doctrine of ' transubstantiation, so as to be justified in refusing even to lose their ' time in reading what may be addressed to them on it; and I avow ' it with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity.'

" As these comparisons are the second store-house, whence the " learned Doctor draws his arguments against our *supposed* idolatry, " it is proper to shew the unreasonableness of his method. For this, " three remarks will, I hope, be sufficient.

1. " The question between Dr. Priestley and us is, Whether there " are *three* Divine Subsistences in the one Divine Essence? Now it " is plain, that to deny this proposition, as *reasonably* as we deny that " bread is flesh, and that wine is human blood, we must be as well " acquainted with the nature of the Divine Essence, and of Divine " Personality, as we are with the taste of bread and wine. But how " widely different is the case, the Doctor himself being judge? Do " not his Disquisitions assert, that *the Divine Essence hath properties* " *most essentially different from every thing else*—that *of God's sub-* " *stance we have no idea at all*—and that *he must forever remain the* " INCOMPREHENSIBLE? Therefore, if God hath revealed, that " he exists with the *three* personal distinctions of Father, Word, and " Holy Ghost, the learned Doctor, after his concessions, can never " deny it, without exposing at once his piety, his philosophy, his " logic, and his common sense; unless he should make it appear, " that he is the first man, who can pertinently speak of *what he has* " *no idea at all*, and who perfectly comprehends what must forever " remain INCOMPREHENSIBLE. But,

2. " The question between the Pope and us, with respect to tran- " substantiation, is quite within our reach; since it is only, whe- " ther *bread* be *flesh* and *bones*; whether *wine* be *human blood*; whe- " ther the same identical body can be *wholly* in heaven, and in a " million of places on earth, *at the same time*; and whether a thin " round wafer, an inch in diameter, is the real person of a man five

all the properties of the Divine Nature as well as we understand all the common properties of bread and wine? Does the doctrine of the Holy Trinity contradict all our senses as transubstantiation does? Certainly no. The cases are not parallel, and the comparison will not hold. No man therefore can urge this objection, whose mind is not blinded with the most invincible prejudice. It is reasoning from what we are confessedly ignorant of in a very high degree, to what we are intimately acquainted with; whereas we ought to reason directly the contrary; from what we well understand, to what we understand not at all, or less perfectly.

"Do what you can, says the Socinian, you must "either sacrifice the Unity to the Trinity, or the Tri- "nity to the Unity: for they are incompatible.

"But who says it? Certainly not our Lord, who "commands all nations to be baptized into the *one* "name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy "Ghost. And if Dr. P. say it, then he says it with- "out KNOWING it; for speaking like a judicious Phi- "losopher, he has just told us, that *probably the Divine* "*Nature, besides being simply* UNKNOWN TO HIM, *most* "*essentially differs from the human in* MANY *circumstan-* "*ces, of which he hath* NO KNOWLEDGE AT ALL. "To this sufficient answer, we beg leave to add an illus- "tration,

"or six feet high. Here, we only decide about things known to us "from the cradle, and, concerning which, our daily experience, and "our five senses, help us to bear a right judgment, agreeable to the "tenor of the scripture. Therefore,

3. "Considering that the two cases are diametrically contrary, "and differ as much as the depths of the Divine Nature differ from "a piece of bread; as much as the most incomprehensible thing in "heaven, differs from the things we know best upon earth—we are "bold to say, that, when the learned Doctor involves the Protestant "worshippers of the Trinity, and the Popish worshippers of a bit "of bread, in the same charge of absurd idolatry, he betrays as "great a degree of *unphilosophical* prejudice, and *illogical* reasoning, "as ever a learned and wise man was driven to, in the *height* of a "disputation for a favourite error."

Are they both equally absurd? Do we understand all

" *stantiation*, the learned Doctor loses no opportunity to compare " that *pretended* mystery, that *despicable* absurdity, with the *awful* " mystery of the Trinity—exhorting us to reject them both, as " equally contrary to reason and common sense. Thus, in his Ap- " peal to the Professors of Christianity, speaking of the Divinity of " Christ, he says, ' The prevalence of so impious a doctrine can be ' ascribed to nothing but that mystery of iniquity, which began to ' work in the times of the Apostles themselves.—This, among other ' shocking corruptions of Christianity, grew up with the system of ' Popery. After exalting a man into God, a creature into a creator, ' men made a piece of bread into one also, and then bowed down to, ' and worshipped the work of their own hands. " And, in the Preface " of his Disquisitions, he writes," ' Most Protestants will avow they ' have *made up their minds* with respect to the Popish doctrine of ' transubstantiation, so as to be justified in refusing even to lose their ' time in reading what may be addressed to them on it; and I avow ' it with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity.'

" As these comparisons are the second store-house, whence the " learned Doctor draws his arguments against our *supposed* idolatry, " it is proper to shew the unreasonableness of his method. For this, " three remarks will, I hope, be sufficient.

1. " The question between Dr. Priestley and us is, Whether there " are *three* Divine Subsistences in the one Divine Essence? Now it " is plain, that to deny this proposition, as *reasonably* as we deny that " bread is flesh, and that wine is human blood, we must be as well " acquainted with the nature of the Divine Essence, and of Divine " Personality, as we are with the taste of bread and wine. But how " widely different is the case, the Doctor himself being judge? Do " not his Disquisitions assert, that *the Divine Essence hath properties* " *most essentially different from every thing else*—that *of God's sub-* " *stance we have no idea at all*—and that *he must forever remain the* " INCOMPREHENSIBLE? Therefore, if God hath revealed, that " he exists with the *three* personal distinctions of Father, Word, and " Holy Ghost, the learned Doctor, after his concessions, can never " deny it, without exposing at once his piety, his philosophy, his " logic, and his common sense; unless he should make it appear, " that he is the first man, who can pertinently speak of *what he has* " *no idea at all*, and who perfectly comprehends what must forever " remain INCOMPREHENSIBLE. But,

2. " The question between the Pope and us, with respect to tran- " substantiation, is quite within our reach; since it is only, whe- " ther *bread* be *flesh* and *bones*; whether *wine* be *human blood*; whe- " ther the same identical body can be *wholly* in heaven, and in a " million of places on earth, *at the same time*; and whether a thin " round wafer, an inch in diameter, is the real person of a man five

all the properties of the Divine Nature as well as we understand all the common properties of bread and wine? Does the doctrine of the Holy Trinity contradict all our senses as transubstantiation does? Certainly no. The cases are not parallel, and the comparison will not hold. No man therefore can urge this objection, whose mind is not blinded with the most invincible prejudice. It is reasoning from what we are confessedly ignorant of in a very high degree, to what we are intimately acquainted with; whereas we ought to reason directly the contrary; from what we well understand, to what we understand not at all, or less perfectly.

" Do what you can, says the Socinian, you must " either sacrifice the Unity to the Trinity, or the Tri- " nity to the Unity: for they are incompatible.

" But who says it? Certainly not our Lord, who " commands all nations to be baptized into the *one* " name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy " Ghost. And if Dr. P. say it, then he says it with- " out KNOWING it; for speaking like a judicious Phi- " losopher, he has just told us, that *probably the Divine* " *Nature, besides being simply* UNKNOWN TO HIM, *most* " *essentially differs from the human in* MANY *circumstan-* " *ces, of which he hath* NO KNOWLEDGE AT ALL. " To this sufficient answer, we beg leave to add an illus- " tration,

" or six feet high. Here, we only decide about things known to us " from the cradle, and, concerning which, our daily experience, and " our five senses, help us to bear a right judgment, agreeable to the " tenor of the scripture. Therefore,

3. " Considering that the two cases are diametrically contrary, " and differ as much as the depths of the Divine Nature differ from " a piece of bread; as much as the most incomprehensible thing in " heaven, differs from the things we know best upon earth—we are " bold to say, that, when the learned Doctor involves the Protestant " worshippers of the Trinity, and the Popish worshippers of a bit " of bread, in the same charge of absurd idolatry, he betrays as " great a degree of *unphilosophical* prejudice, and *illogical* reasoning, " as ever a learned and wise man was driven to, in the *height* of a " disputation for a favourite error."

" tration, which may throw some light upon the Doc-
" tor's *unphilosophical* positiveness.

" Modern physicians justly maintain the circulation
" of the blood, which being carried from the heart
" through the *arteries*, flows back to it by the *veins*.
" But a learned Doctor, very fond of unity, availing
" himself of the connexion which the *arteries* have with
" the *veins* in all the extremities of the body, insists
" that *one* set of vessels is more agreeable to the sim-
" plicity of the human frame. What! says he, Arte-
" ries! Veins! and lymphatic Vessels too! I pro-
" nounce that *one* set of uniform, circular vessels, is
" quite sufficient. You must therefore sacrifice the
" *arteries* to the *veins*, or the *veins* to the *arteries*; for
" they are quite incompatible. This dogmatical po-
" sitiveness of the Unitarian Anatomist, would surprize
" us the more, if we had just heard him say, that there
" are MANY THINGS in anatomy, of which he has NO
" KNOWLEDGE AT ALL, and assert, that the minute
" ramifications, and delicate connexions of the vessels
" which compose the human frame, *are, and must for-*
" *ever remain* INCOMPREHENSIBLE to those who have
" our feeble and imperfect organs.

" From this simile, which, we hope, is not improper,
" we infer, that if positiveness on this anatomical ques-
" tion would not become the learning and modesty of a
" Doctor in Physic, a like degree of peremptori-
" ness and assurance, in a matter infinitely more out of
" our reach, is as unsuitable to the humble candour of
" a Doctor in Divinity, as to the cautious wisdom
" of a Philosopher." [7]

It is, moreover, perpetually objected by those who are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own conceit, that is, by the vain-glorious philosophers of the day; It is not in our power to believe what we will,

[7] This argument is wholly taken from Mr. Fletcher before mentioned.

will, but we must have reason and evidence on our side.

Experience, however, will easily make it appear, that the inclination of man has frequently more influence upon our belief, than reason and argument. What any man would willingly have to be true, he finds it not difficult to believe. Nothing is more common than for inclination to over-rule reason. Where affection and prepossession take place, there judgment becomes partial and blind, and we are made capable of embracing the most absurd propositions in nature. We refuse our assent as often for want of inclination as we do for want of argument and evidence; and we may say with a respectable writer—"What men *at first* call reason, and "afterwards conscience; is oftentimes no other than "affectation, and prejudice, and wilfulness crept into the "chair." We may therefore safely conclude, that an humble and ready faith, *casting down imaginations, and every thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of Christ*, is the only expedient both to make and keep men wise.[8]

Another argument for the pre-existence and divinity of Christ arises from the history of the various heresies which sprung up in the Christian church in the earliest ages. We know when most of them arose, what was the occasion of them, and what reception they met with from the Apostles and their immediate successors. Simon Magus was the first heretic, and the father of all heresy. Hymeneus and Philetus denied the resurrection. Others, who are anonymous, maintained the necessity of circumcision, and of observing the law of Moses. Others asserted, that Christ had not come in the flesh. Some denied Jesus to be the Christ. Some said he had no divine nature; others, he had no human. All these, and abundance of other errors, crept into the church within the two first centuries, and were strenuously opposed by St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John, Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, and others, who all maintained, with unshaken confidence, that Jesus Christ not only pre-existed,

[8] See Young's Sermons, p. 87.

existed, but was the proper Son of God, and the creator of the world. All this they not only asserted, but treated the oppugners thereof with great and just indignation. I add, lastly, that

When the several kingdoms in Europe had been buried in Egyptian darkness for many ages, through the prevalence of the corruptions of the church of Rome, the Reformation took place in the sixteenth century. And it is remarkable, that all the churches in Christendom, which cast off the delusions of popery, still retained the doctrine of the Trinity as a fundamental article of the Christian religion. However they might differ from each other in smaller matters, they were all perfectly agreed in this one principle. The confession of the Helvetic, the French, the Belgic, the English, the Scotch, the Polish, the Saxon, the Bohemian, the German churches, the churches of the Swedes and Danes, besides the different denominations of Dissenters in this country: These all, or in general, professed to make the holy scriptures alone the rule of their faith; they all differed very materially one from another, in several respects; and yet they all agreed, that the doctrine of the Trinity is not only scriptural but fundamental in Christianity. [9]

In answer to every thing that can be advanced in favour of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, it is further objected, that there are various passages of scripture, which speak a different language, and seem to say, that he is a mere human creature.

It is readily granted there are several scriptures of this kind; and if any of them asserted plainly and unequivocally that Christ was a mere man, and no more than a mere man, then we should be obliged, either to conclude, that the scriptures contradicted themselves, or that all the other passages, which represent him as being

[9] See this proved at large by some London Ministers in the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity stated and defended.

ing more than man, must be brought down to a level with those, which speak of his simple humanity. But seeing some parts of the sacred writings speak of our Saviour as being man, [1] and others speak of him as being God, and the Son of God, it has been the custom in every age of the church, in order to reconcile these seemingly inconsistent declarations, to apply the former to his humanity, and the latter to his divinity. Parallel to the case before us is the account which is given in various parts of scripture, of the nature both of men and angels. Men are sometimes therein said to be mortal, sometimes immortal. Angels too are sometimes spoken of as men, at other times as being what they really are. Two or three instances will illustrate my meaning. The first is that of the angels who appeared to Abraham. They are expressly called men, three times over, in the compass of the eighteenth chapter of Genesis, and yet the whole context shews them to have been angels, and one of the three to have been even the Lord of angels, and the Judge of all the earth.

Another instance may be, the history of the two angels, who appeared to Lot, while he dwelt at Sodom. In that short account, they are four times denominated men, though the whole history declares them to have been angels.

So in the story of Manoah and the angel, he is more than once called both a man, and a man of God, and yet he gave sufficient proof that he was of more than mortal origin.

In like manner when Gabriel descended from heaven, in answer to the prayer of Daniel, he is positively called the man Gabriel. [2]

[1] "We can no more conclude that Jesus Christ is not God, because the Holy Spirit sometimes speaks of him as a simple man, than we can conclude, that he is not man, because he speaks of him sometimes as God."

Saurin by Robinson, vol. 3. p. 119.

[2] Dan. 9. 21.

We have other instances in the New Testament. The two angels, who appeared to the women, that were coming to anoint the body of Jesus, after his crucifixion, are said to have been two men in shining garments.[3] And afterwards, when he ascended into heaven, two men in white apparel stood by the disciples, and told them, that Jesus shall come again in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven.[4]

Now, if any one should insist, that the angels are no more than mere men, because they are sometimes called by that name, as in the several instances here produced, he would act just as improperly as they do, who attempt to prove, that the Son of God is possessed of a nature no higher than humanity, because he is sometimes denominated a man, and the son of man. We will, however, proceed to produce some of the most remarkable of those scriptures, which speak for the humanity of Christ, and are usually urged by the Socinians to prove, that he is nothing more than man. The order in which they are found in the bible may be as convenient as any other.

1. *Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God.* Mat. 19. 17.

To see the force of this, we must reason with the man upon his own mistaken principles. Why do you call me good, whom you do not believe to be any other than a mere man? There is none truly good but God, who is the only author of all goodness and happiness. This is the common answer that is given to the difficulty in this text, and appears sufficiently satisfactory. It seems a question proposed to the man, as in Mat. 9. 28. Ibid. 22. 43. and John 9. 35. to make him profess his belief of our Lord's being the Son of God. See a good criticism on the Greek text in Jones's Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, chap. 1. sect. 24. See too Dr. Trapp on the Trinity, p. 109, 110.

2. *To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give,*

[3] Luke 24. 4.——[4] Acts 1. 10, 11.

give, but it shall be given unto them for whom it is prepared of my Father. Mat. 20. 23.

This difficulty is solved by this single observation, that Christ derived his divine nature from his Father as well as his human, and that through the whole of his life here in the world, he acted as his Father's delegate. It was no part of his undertaking here below to allot to men their future abodes. The law promulged from the eternal throne, is, that every man shall be rewarded, not according to peculiar and foolish partialities, but according to his works.—Our blessed Saviour has promised elsewhere, to bestow this reward in his *own right: To him that overcometh will* I GRANT *to* SIT *with me in* MY THRONE. Rev. 3. 21. Consult Jones on the Trinity, chap. 1. sect. 32, for a criticism on the original text.

3. *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* Mat. 28. 19.

Christ was mediator between God and man. As his divine nature had ineffably existed with his Father from everlasting, so his human nature became invested, after his resurrection, with universal dominion. He was exalted as God-Man mediator, where he ever liveth to make intercession, and sitteth at his Father's right hand till all opposing power is reduced into subjection to his authority.

4. *But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Mark 13. 32.

As God, Christ knew all things, and was possessed of all possible perfection. As man, he was ignorant of many things, the day of judgment in particular. He grew in wisdom, as well as in stature. It was no part of his commission among men, to reveal the particular time when this event shall be. This last seems to be the sense of the passage, because he is frequently said in other parts of scripture to know all things. See a good solution of the difficulty contained in this text in Waterland's Eight

Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, p. 268—273. And for a defence of the Fathers on the passage, consult his Vindication of the Divinity of Christ, p. 104—112 and p. 415. See too what Dr. Bishop has advanced in his Eight Sermons at Lady Moyer's lecture, p. 107—116. Consult also Trapp on the Trinity p. 113, 114.

" Our Saviour's design in this place being only to " represent the day here spoken of as a secret not to " be made known unto men until it should come upon " them, that they might always stand upon their guard, " watch, and prepare for it: let but the word *know* be " taken to signify *make known* (which fully answers the " design of the place, and, as it is evident, St. Paul " uses the same word. 1 Cor. 2. 2. *I determined*, says, " he, *not to know*, that is, not to make known or teach, " *any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified:)* and then the most natural paraphrase of that " place will be this—*But that day and hour there is no " one who shall or can make known unto you; no, not the " angels which are in heaven* (who may be supposed to " be ignorant of it themselves) *nor even the Son himself* (who, although *he knoweth all things.* John 21. " 17, *yet can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the " Father do.* John 5. 19, and *who speaketh not of himself, but the Father which sent him gave him commandment what he should say.* John 12. 49.) *but the Father only shall in his own time, make it known by bringing it to pass.*[5]

5. *My Father is greater than I.* John 14. 28.

This would have been a declaration of the utmost impudence, on the supposition Christ was no more than a mere man, or an angel. But admitting he was the eternal Son of his eternal Father, and acted under him as mediator and delegate, to say, *My Father is greater than I,* is highly proper, and a sentiment worthy of his piety. The Father is the fountain of the Godhead, from whence the Son eternally derived his eternal existence.

[5] Gentleman's Religion, p. 2. p. 26, 27.

istence. There is therefore a precedence in the Father as Father, " such as the priority of earthly parents may " be supposed to possess, though at the same time the " most perfect equality of nature remains." See Hawker's Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, p. 176—178, for a sensible observation on this passage. Consult Clarke on the Trinity, p. 141—147. Ibid. p. 260—263. Ibid. 273—281. Dr. Bishop too has given a good view of the text, and produced other testimonies from the Fathers, besides those in Dr. Clarke's book. Consult likewise Trapp on the Trinity, p. 115—124.

6. *And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* John 17. 3.

There were two grand points, which all that were converted to the Christian faith were to learn: they were to turn from all their false gods to serve the one true God, and to believe that Jesus was the Christ. This, and no other is the lesson conveyed in these words. They assert nothing more. The true God is used in opposition to false gods; Jesus Christ in opposition to all other saviours.

This passage of scripture being more important than ordinary, we will examine in what manner the Ancients understood it.

" Our Lord preached to those who had fallen into " polytheism the one only true God his Father." Ignat. larger Epist. to the Mag. Sect. 11.

" If Christ would not have us understand him also " to be God, why did he add these words—*And Jesus* " *Christ whom thou hast sent?* for which addition there " could be no other reason, but this, that he would have " himself taken for God; for were it otherwise, he " would have added, *And the man Christ Jesus whom* " *thou hast sent:* he added, however, no such thing; " but here joined himself to God, that by this conjunc- " tion we might understand him to be, what indeed he " is,

" is, God." Tertul. quoted by Maldonatus on the place.

St. Austin has it thus:—" The order in which these " words are to be understood is this—*That they may* " *know thee, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, to be* " *the only true God.*" De Trin. l. 6. c. 9.

Athanasius says, " These two clauses of our Lord's " speech are knit together by the copulative, and the " sense of them is, *That they may know thy Son to be* " *the true God, even as they know thee the Father to* " *be so:*" Disp. ad, Arium.

Basil has it thus:—" Our Lord calls his Father, *the* " *only true God*; not as if his person alone were so, but " in opposition to those idols which were then thought " to be God, but were not so: but the title of the true " God doth equally belong to the Father and the Son." Adv. Eunom. l. 4.

In short; all the ancient writers, who have had occasion to mention this text of scripture, speak of it much in the same stile with the above. And the reader will please to take notice, that there is a very wide difference between saying *the Father is the only true God*, and *the Father only is the true God.* The former is our Lord's declaration, the latter is the meaning Socinians put upon it.

Grotius upon the place saith, " The Father is called " *the only true God*, to exclude all those whom the false " persuasion of the Gentiles had introduced for gods."

Erasmus too has much the same sentiment:—" When " our Lord stiles his Father, *the only true God*, he does " not exclude himself, who is the Son; but distinguishes " the true God from the idols of the Heathens."

Consult Trapp on the Trinity, p. 110—113, and Whitby on the place.

7. *Unto us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him.* 1 Cor. 8. 6.

Nothing is asserted in this passage contrary to what

is called the catholic faith. There is one God, and one Mediator. Whether that Mediator is a person in the divine substance is neither asserted, nor denied in this place. If the term God is used in an exclusive sense, it proves too much: for we may as well say, there is but one Lord, as that there is but one God.

Origen has spoken pretty much at large upon this passage of scripture:—"I wonder how any one," says he, "who reads what the apostle Paul has said, that *there* "*is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one* "*Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things*, should yet "deny that they ought to confess the Son of God to be "God, lest they should seem to acknowledge two Gods. "How will they dispose of this passage of the Apostle, "in which Christ is openly declared to be God over "all? Rom. 9. 5. But they who hold these opinions "do not consider, that as he has not termed the Lord "Jesus Christ the one Lord in such an exclusive man-"ner, that God the Father shall not be Lord; so also "he has not denominated God the Father, God in such "an exclusive manner, as that the Son shall not be be-"lieved to be God." In Epist. ad Rom. lib. 7. chap. "9.

8. *The head of Christ is God.* 1 Cor. 11. 3.

This is similar to some of the foregoing. The Father is the fountain of the Godhead. Christ derived his deity from him; his humanity from him; his mediatorial office from him. In all these, and in every other possible sense, *the head of Christ is God:* but it by no means from hence follows, that Christ is no more than man.

9. *Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father.* 1 Cor. 15. 24.

This is one of the most difficult portions of sacred scripture, not because of any thing in itself, but because it is an imperfect revelation. It is a hint thrown out concerning a great event which is to take place in the world of glory, but not pursued to any length. The

force

force of it seems to lie in this circumstance, that when all the purposes for which Christ undertook the mediatorial office shall have been answered, that office shall cease, as being no longer necessary, and pure deity shall alone continue. But this does not prove that Christ will then in *all* respects cease to be a king. His natural and essential kingdom will have no end. But his mediatorial dignity and office will cease through eternity, as being no longer necessary. This view seems calculated to reconcile this passage with that other of St. Luke, where he says, *He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* See Jones on the Trinity, chap. 1. sect. 25.

This difficult passage of scripture is very well explained by Peter Martyr, as quoted by Bishop Bull in his Prim. et Apost. Tradit. cap. 6. sect. 9. "To reign "is sometimes taken for excelling others, having the "pre-eminence, or highest place over others. Now "in this sense Christ will always reign. But if we say, "that to reign is the same as to exercise the offices of "a king, to fight for, to defend, to conquer, and the "like; Christ will not always reign. For when we "are perfect and complete, we shall have no occasion "for the aids of Christ. When he came into the world, "he preached, he taught, he died for our salvation; "now also he intercedes for us with the Father, he "defends us from eminent dangers, and never intermits his mediatorial offices and actions. But at the "end, when he hath made an universal peace, he will "resign these offices to the Father, because then there "will be no further occasion for them. Thus, when "a powerful prince sends his only son to some province "of his realm, which is seditious, tumultuary, and rebellious, the son goes with command and strong force; "but when he has quieted the commotions, and subdued the rebels, he returns conqueror to his father, "triumphs, and delivers up the province in peace to his

" his father, no longer uses the military command, or " the legions, &c."

10. *There is one Lord, and one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.* Ep. 4. 5, 6.

This asserts only that there is one God, and one Mediator, whom he calls one Lord. God's being called one God, no more excludes Christ from that high title, than Christ's being called the one Lord, excludes the Father from the same appellation and dominion.

11. *For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* 1 Tim. 2. 5.

This is in the same predicament with some of the foregoing. There is one God and one Mediator. If the stress is laid on *man:* It is replied, The angels are frequently called the same, but yet they, at the very time, were possessed of an higher nature. St. Cyprian says, " This " Christ is our God, who put on man, that, as a media- " tor between both, he might lead man to the Father." De Vanit. Idol.

12. *The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass.* Rev. 1. 1.

The sentiment here is the same as in many other places. Christ acted as his Father's delegate, and derived all his authority from him. His mediatorial and delegated office will continue till the consummation of all things, when, every opposing power being brought into subjection, he will deliver up his office to his Father, and God shall be all in all.

It is possible these answers to objections may not give satisfaction to the minds of some readers. Nor is it likely that any thing, which can be written upon so profound a subject, will give satisfaction to every reader. Difficulties will occur, what opinions soever we embrace. But if difficulties attending a doctrine, otherwise well established on scripture evidence, are permitted to operate upon the mind, to its entire subversion, there is no one principle either of natural or re-

vealed religion, however important in itself, can possibly keep its ground. Many of the doctrines of religion are attended with circumstances of the most palpable incomprehensibility to the present confined and limited powers of man. The existence and perfections of God, the immortality of the human soul, the resurrection of the body: who can enumerate the difficulties attending these indisputable doctrines of natural and revealed religion? But when once a doctrine is firmly established upon a scriptural foundation, the difficulties attending a full comprehension of it must give way, in every case short of contradiction. [6]

I observe still farther, that the word of God is the best authority in the world upon every subject where it is concerned. If it contains any particular proposition, we may be well satisfied such proposition contains an undoubted truth, whether we are able to comprehend all the reasons of it or otherwise. [7] The government of

[6] There are some other passages of scripture that are supposed to militate against the divinity of Christ, but which all admit of a reasonable solution. Those I have mentioned seem the strongest of any. If the Reader is dissatisfied with the answers given, he may have recourse to the Commentators, where they are considered more at large. Whitby alone, on the New Testament, will be found competent to the satisfying the scruples of all dispassionate inquirers into the truths of the divine word. To him, therefore, I will refer the Reader whenever he is pressed with an objection to the Divinity of his Saviour. The great Dr. John Owen, when speaking on this subject, says: "For my part, I do not see in any thing, but that the "testimonies given to the God-head of Christ, the eternal Son of "God, are every way as clear and unquestionable as those are, "which testify to the Being of God, or that there is any God at "all."

On the Trinity, p. 40.

[7] That is a fine simile of the honourable Robert Boyle where he says:—"As among the stars, that shine in the firmament, though "there be a disparity of greatness compared one to another, yet "they are all of them lucid and celestial bodies, and the least of "them far vaster than any thing on earth; so of the two testaments, "that compose the bible, though there may be some disparity in re-"lation to themselves, yet are they both heavenly and instructive

of the world belongs not to man. What is therein delivered is as firm as the throne of God. His power is engaged to fulfil what his mouth hath spoken. And as he is a God without iniquity, just and right in all his ways, we may be assured, what he hath declared by his servants, the Prophets and Apostles, shall every jot and tittle be found true. It is inconsistent with his nature to set his seal to a lie. If therefore any particular doctrine is found in the Lively Oracles, we hesitate not to embrace it as the truth of God, even though it should be liable to a variety of objections.[8] No doctrine of revelation, indeed, can be true that is contradictory to any other doctrine either of nature or of revelation: nor can any be founded in truth that is not perfectly consistent with the purest principles of sound reason and philosophy. But surely it cannot be justly argued from

" volumes, and inestimably out-valuing any the earth affords, or " human pens ever traced. And I must add, that as mineralists ob- " serve, that rich mines are wont to lie hid in those grounds, whose " surface bears no fruit trees, (too much maligned by the arsenical " and resembling fumes) nor is well stored with useful plants or " verdure; (as if God would endear those ill-favoured lands by " giving them great portions :) so divers passages of holy writ, " which appear barren and unpromising to our first survey, and hold " not obviously forth instructions or promises, being by a sedulous " artist searched into (and the original word ερυνατε used in that " text of *Search the scriptures*. John 5. 39, does properly enough " signify the searching for hid treasure) afford, out of their pene- " trated bowels, rich and precious mysteries of divinity."

On the Style of Scripture, 4th Obj. p. 109.

[8] " When philosophy and the scripture *seem* to disagree, it is al- " ways the safest course to believe what is taught by God, whose " exact veracity is included in his most perfect nature, who posseses " an intellect, not only of a superior order to ours, but truly omni- " scient, and who does most clearly know, not only all gradual veri- " ties, and all those, that are but conditional truths, or grounded up- " on suppositions, but all the complete, absolute and eternal truths, " that our philosophy and reasonings are built on: and, most pro- " bably, many more, neither attained, nor so much as attainable, by " natural reason; though never so well improved by merely human " philosophy."

Boyle's Christian Virtuoso, p. 680.

from this concession, that no doctrine is to be embraced but what we fully comprehend. We believe the existence, the eternity, the immensity, the omnipotence, the omniscience, and every other perfection of the Supreme Being: but what man upon earth pretends to comprehend how these things are? Reason and revelation concur in establishing the reality of the facts; but neither reason nor revelation inform us how they are. And it is, moreover, exceedingly probable, that if we had been informed much more fully concerning these deep things of God, we have no powers to comprehend them. Yet we believe them, and act upon the persuasion, through the whole course of our lives. In like manner we believe the unity of God. This we are confirmed in the persuasion of both by reason and revelation. But while reason has nothing to reply, being lost in the profundity of the subject, revelation informs us, that in this unity of nature, there are three persons, distinguished by the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; three persons engaged for the salvation of the human race, to whom are frequently ascribed divine and incommunicable perfections. Not knowing how to reconcile these things in any other or better manner, we say, the Godhead is one, but the persons in that one Godhead are three: and we worship this one Godhead under these three personal distinctions: To the Father, the fountain of the Godhead, we ascribe, emphatically, Creation; to the Son, Redemption; and to the Holy Ghost, Sanctification; and in this order we pay our adorations. These principles we believe, and these practices we observe, not because we pretend to comprehend the mode and manner how the one is three, and three are one; but because the holy scriptures have given us this information. We receive the doctrine on what we conceive to be the authority of heaven. Our scriptures teach us this doctrine. We have examined the authenticity and authority of those scriptures, and we find that authenticity to be unquestionable, and that authority to

be

be such as commands our assent. While this is our situation, we can do no other than embrace the doctrine of the Sacred Three. Not to do so would be absolute rebellion against the highest obligations, and to involve ourselves in deserved condemnation. If we err herein, we err in good company. If we are mistaken, we mistake with the greatest and best of men. Friends and enemies have concurred in sentiment with us, that the scriptures do actually contain the doctrine. Jews, Heathens, Mahometans, all concur with the great body of Christians from the beginning, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of our New Testament. We are so far, therefore, from feeling shame at being thought to embrace this sentiment, that we glory in the principle before the assembled world of infidels and philosophers, and are persuaded it throws a divine lustre over the records of our salvation, and makes them worthy of God to reveal, and of all acceptation by man.[9]

[9] See the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity vindicated from the objections of Socinians in the 44th Sermon of archbishop Tillotson.

An Apology for the Doctrine of the Trinity.

PART FIRST.

SECTION I.

Information concerning the Messiah for the first three thousand years of the World.

THE general observations intended being dispatched, we will now proceed to investigate the several doctrines themselves. And that this may be done with greater precision, let it first be considered, what genuine Christianity is.—Real Christianity, then, it will be granted by every person, let his private views of it be what they may, is that mode of worshipping and serving the Almighty, which the gospel of Christ requires of us. Whoever serves God in this way, is truly religious. Whoever serves God in any other way, if he lives under the dispensation of the gospel, is not truly religious.

Now, the gospel of our blessed Saviour plainly contains the following principles:

1. There is a God.
2. Man is an accountable creature.
3. He hath offended his Maker, and is become a sinner.
4. He hath contracted, in some way or other, wrong propensities, and is now depraved in his moral powers.
5. He is absolutely incapable of making satisfaction to his Creator for the sins he hath committed; and equally as incapable of rectifying the disorders of his nature, without divine assistance.
6. God hath taken pity on his creature, and provided, and

and made known, both a Saviour to die for his sins, and also an Holy Spirit to rectify the moral disorders of his nature.

7. This Saviour, and this Sanctifier, are spoken of through the scripture in terms that signify the highest dignity, as being partakers of real divinity.

We will confine ourselves to this last proposition. And, in order to examine the matter to the bottom, we will pursue the following method:

1. SEE WHAT THE SCRIPTURES INFORM US CONCERNING THIS SAVIOUR.

2. WE WILL THEN EXAMINE WHAT THE WORD OF GOD REVEALS CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT.

3. PRODUCE THE SCRIPTURAL ACCOUNT OF THE SACRED TRINITY.

4. SEE WHAT THE ANCIENT JEWS THOUGHT OF THESE SUBJECTS.

5. WHAT THE LEARNED HEATHEN.

6. WHAT THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

7. WE MAY AFTERWARDS THROW THE WHOLE INTO ONE VIEW.

It is not needful to attempt here to prove the existence of a Supreme Being, as it is agreed on all hands, that "there is" one, and "but one, living and true God, "everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of in-"finite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker "and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisi-"ble." The question is, whether "in the unity of "this Godhead there be" not "three persons, of one "substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, "and Holy Ghost?"

In order to determine this, we will, FIRST, ENQUIRE IN WHAT MANNER THE HOLY SCRIPTURES SPEAK OF OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR. And the several passages to this purpose will be best produced, I think, in chronological order, because the nearer we come to the time of his birth, the clearer and fuller the descriptions usually are.

1. The

1. THE first passage we meet with, is that most ancient one recorded in the third chapter of Genesis. It was made immediately after the fall of our great progenitor, and about four thousand years before Jesus Christ was born: *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.* Gen. 3. 15.[a] Does not *the seed of the woman*, the term here made use of, seem to imply, that there should be something supernatural in the person, or

[a] Maimonides, one of the greatest and best of the Jewish writers, who lived in the twelfth century, saith, "This is one of the passages in scripture which is most wonderful, and not to be understood, according to the letter; but contains great wisdom in it." More Nevochim. p. 2. cap. 30.

This prophetic scripture is applied to the Messiah by the most learned of the ancient Jews, as appears both from the Targum of Jonathan, and that of Jerusalem. The former paraphrases the passage thus:—"But I will put enmity between thee and the woman, "between the seed of thy son and the seed of his sons: and it shall "come to pass when the sons of the woman shall observe the precepts of the law, they will endeavour to smite thee on thy head. "But when they shall neglect the precepts of the law, thou shalt "endeavour to bite them on their heel: yet there shall be a remedy "for them, but for thee there shall not be a remedy; because a remedy shall be produced for the heel in the days of king Messiah." —The latter paraphrase has it thus:—"And it shall come to pass "when the children of the woman shall observe the law and perform "the commandments, they will endeavour to bruise thy head and "slay thee; but when the children of the woman shall neglect the "precepts of the law, and observe not the commandments, thou "shalt endeavour to bite them on their heel, and so do them an injury: yet there shall be a remedy for the children of the woman, "but for thee the serpent there shall be no remedy; nevertheless it "shall come to pass, that they shall perform a cure upon each other "on the heel, in the last days, that is in the days of king Messiah."

It may be convenient to observe here, for the sake of the unlearned reader, that these Targums are paraphrases of the Hebrew scriptures into the Chaldean language, and were made before or about the time of our Saviour, to accommodate those persons who did not understand the pure Hebrew language. A good account of them may be seen in Prideaux's Connection of the Old and New Testament, part 2. book 8.

in the birth of the Messiah? Comp. Gal. 4. 4; and 1 John 3. 8.

2. ENOCH, the seventh from Adam, by a prophetic spirit, said, *Behold, the* LORD *cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodlily committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.* Jude 14, 15.

If the *Son* of God is represented in this prophetic passage of scripture as the *Judge* of the world; it is an office, surely, very much above the abilities of any merely human being, however exalted by the favour of his Maker. Compare 1 Thes. 4. 14—18. It is not, indeed, perfectly clear that this prophecy is applicable to the Son, exclusive of the Father. It seems ambiguous.

3. THE next passage which speaks of our Saviour, is that of God to Abraham in the twelfth chapter of Genesis, about 430 years after the flood, and 1920 years before the Messiah came into the world: *Now the Lord had said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in* THEE *shall all families of the earth be blessed.* Gen. 12. 1—3. This promise was first made to Abraham when he was 75 years of age, and afterwards repeated to him nine or ten different times; once the same year; once three years after; twice the same day five years after; once sixteen years after; two or three times again the same year; and once more when he was 125 years of age, and his son Isaac twenty five. All these repetitions of the promise were fundamentally the same, though with some little variation

variation in the expression. Compare Gal. 3. 8, 16; and Mat. 1. 1.

4. About 1800 years before the birth of Christ, and 120 after the calling of Abraham, God appeared to Isaac and renewed to him the promise which had been so frequently made to his father. This was repeated to him but twice: *The Lord appeared unto Isaac, and said, Go not down into Egypt: dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of. Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee: for unto thee and unto thy seed I will give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father. And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and I will give unto thy seed all these countries: and in thy* SEED *shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.* Gen. 26. 2—5. And again, in a more compendious form, at the twenty fourth verse of the same chapter.

5. Several years afterwards God appeared to Jacob, and renewed to him the promise of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, and nearly in the same words: *I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee, and in thy* SEED, *shall all the families of the earth be blessed.* Gen. 28. 13, 14. We have the authority of the two great apostles, Peter and Paul, for applying the promise here made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, at different periods, to the Messiah. Indeed, the words are applicable to no other person that ever was born into the world, and therefore they have been rightly interpreted by all antiquity.

in the birth of the Messiah? Comp. Gal. 4. 4; and 1 John 3. 8.

2. ENOCH, the seventh from Adam, by a prophetic spirit, said, *Behold, the* LORD *cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodlily committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.* Jude 14, 15.

If the *Son* of God is represented in this prophetic passage of scripture as the *Judge* of the world; it is an office, surely, very much above the abilities of any merely human being, however exalted by the favour of his Maker. Compare 1 Thes. 4. 14—18. It is not, indeed, perfectly clear that this prophecy is applicable to the Son, exclusive of the Father. It seems ambiguous.

3. THE next passage which speaks of our Saviour, is that of God to Abraham in the twelfth chapter of Genesis, about 430 years after the flood, and 1920 years before the Messiah came into the world: *Now the Lord had said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in* THEE *shall all families of the earth be blessed.* Gen. 12. 1—3. This promise was first made to Abraham when he was 75 years of age, and afterwards repeated to him nine or ten different times; once the same year; once three years after; twice the same day five years after; once sixteen years after; two or three times again the same year; and once more when he was 125 years of age, and his son Isaac twenty five. All these repetitions of the promise were fundamentally the same, though with some little variation

variation in the expression. Compare Gal. 3. 8, 16; and Mat. 1. 1.

4. About 1800 years before the birth of Christ, and 120 after the calling of Abraham, God appeared to Isaac and renewed to him the promise which had been so frequently made to his father. This was repeated to him but twice: *The Lord appeared unto Isaac, and said, Go not down into Egypt: dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of. Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee: for unto thee and unto thy seed I will give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father. And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and I will give unto thy seed all these countries: and in thy* SEED *shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.* Gen. 26. 2—5. And again, in a more compendious form, at the twenty fourth verse of the same chapter.

5. Several years afterwards God appeared to Jacob, and renewed to him the promise of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, and nearly in the same words: *I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee, and in thy* SEED, *shall all the families of the earth be blessed.* Gen. 28. 13, 14. We have the authority of the two great apostles, Peter and Paul, for applying the promise here made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, at different periods, to the Messiah. Indeed, the words are applicable to no other person that ever was born into the world, and therefore they have been rightly interpreted by all antiquity.

6. * THE prayer of good old Jacob for the children of his son Joseph, in the forty eight chapter of this book, seems to have been addressed to the Messiah, whom he calls *the* ANGEL *which redeemed him from all evil: And Jacob blessed Joseph, and said,* GOD, *before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the* GOD *which fed me all my life long unto this day, the* ANGEL *which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.* Gen. 48. 15, 16.

Many of the most learned, both of the ancient Jews and Christians, understood this whole passage of no other than the *Son* of God, the *Angel* of the covenant, in whom God's name dwelt;[2] for God the Father is never called an angel. Indeed there would be the most manifest impropriety in such a denomination. For by whom should the Father of the universe be sent?

7. THE next promise we have of the Messiah is in the forty ninth chapter of Genesis: *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until* SHILOH *come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.*[3] Gen. 49. 10. This was given about 1690 years before the birth of our Saviour, and is generally understood both by Jews and Christians of the Messiah.

8.

[2] See an excellent Dissertation on this subject by Allix, at the end of his "Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians." Consult also Ainsworth and Patrick on the place.

[3] Onkelos paraphrases this verse in the following manner:—"He "that hath dominion shall not be removed from the house of Judah, "nor a scribe from the sons of his children, until Messiah comes, "whose is the kingdom, and whom the people shall obey."

The Jerusalem Targum is much the same:—"Kings shall not "fail from the house of Judah, nor skilful teachers of the law from "the sons of his children until the time when king Messiah shall "come. His is the kingdom, and him at length shall all the king-"doms of the earth obey. How beautiful is king Messiah, who "shall arise from the house of Judah!"

See Prideaux's Connection, part 2d. book 8. page 579, 580, on this verse. Consult too Ainsworth and Patrick on the place.

8. I HAVE *waited for thy salvation, O* LORD. Gen. 49. 18.[4]

The salvation here spoken of, is understood by the ancient Jews to be the salvation of Messiah, who is addressed by the dying Patriarch with the incommunicable name JEHOVAH.[5] Nor is there any thing strained and far fetched in this supposition, when we consider, that he gave indisputable proofs of being under divine influence, by predicting the fortunes of his children to the latest generations. And as it is allowed on all hands, that he prophesied of the coming of Christ in the tenth verse, it was very natural for the good old man to break out, in the course of his prophetic discourse, when almost spent, and ready to expire with fatigue; *I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord:* I long to see that happy day, when thou shalt appear for the deliverance of thy people. If this is a just view, Jacob, as well as Abraham, foresaw the day of Christ.

9.

[4] Jonathan paraphrases the verse thus:—"Jacob said when he "saw," (by the prophetic Spirit with which he was inspired) "Gideon the son of Joash, and Samson the son of Manoah, who "should be deliverers: The salvation of Gideon I expect not, nei- "ther the salvation of Samson do I regard, because their salvation "is a temporal salvation; but I expect and regard thy salvation, O "Lord, because thy salvation is an everlasting salvation."

The Jerusalem Targum runs thus:—"Our father Jacob said, "My soul expects not the redemption of Gideon the son of Joash, "which is temporal; neither the redemption of Samson, which is a "created salvation; but the redemption which thou hast declared by "thy word shall come to thy people the children of Israel; this thy "salvation my soul waiteth for."

The lesser Venetian copy of the Targum is somewhat different:— "Our father Jacob said in his prophecy, I have expected thy re- "demption, O Lord; not the redemption of Gideon—not the re- "demption of Samson—but the redemption of the Messiah, the son "of David, which will be for the deliverance of the children of "Israel, and their freedom from bondage. This thy salvation my "soul waits for."—See Fleming's Christology, page 142.

[5] Possibly, the Jehovah here addressed may not mean king Messiah, but rather the Father of Jesus Christ. It seems ambiguous.

9. * THE story of Melchizedek, recorded in the fourteenth chapter of this book, should have come in immediately after the mention of Abraham; but as his history and that of Isaac and Jacob are so closely connected, we have reserved it for this place, that it might not interfere with them, though it be a little out of its proper order. The history of this pious priest and king, then, as expounded by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, contains an unquestionable proof, not only of the pre-existence, but of the eternal existence, of our blessed Saviour. For, because this eminent type of Christ had no beginning of days recorded of him, the Apostle says, he was *without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life*; and in these respects he was *made like unto the Son of God*, and *abideth a priest continually*.[6] Comp. Gen. 14. 17—24, with Heb. 7. 1—10.

10. IF we compare Ex. 17. 7, with 1 Cor. 10. 9, we shall have an incontestable proof, that Christ in the latter place is the JEHOVAH described in the former, and consequently, that he is possessed of real and proper divinity, because JEHOVAH is allowed on all hands to be an incommunicable name: *And Moses called the name of the place Massah and Meribah, because of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us or not?* The Apostle's words are, *Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed*

[6] Dr. Jortin says on this passage:—"What Melchizedek was "figuratively, Christ was really. Melchizedek had neither beginning of days, nor end of life, nothing being recorded in scripture "with regard to his birth or death, consequently the Son of God had "in *reality* neither beginning of days nor end of life." Remarks on Eccl. Hist. vol. 3. p. 89. See also Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 248.

destroyed of serpents.[7] How could they tempt Christ, if he had no existence? It is evident, therefore, from this single comparison, that St. Paul believed the pre-existence, at least, of our blessed Saviour, and from various other places, that he was a determined advocate for his divinity. Compare Gal. 3. 8, 17. Dr. Priestley finds himself so pressed with these and such like passages, that he has no way of answering them, but by saying of the Apostles in general, that they "often applied "the scriptures very improperly, and with no "better judgment than their unbelieving contry-"men;" and of St. Paul in particular that he "often reasons inconclusively."

Socinianism must be hard put to it, before declarations like these could be made by one of its most able and zealous advocates, seeing it is in fact a yielding the day to orthodoxy.

11. THE *people spake against God and against Moses. And the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died. Therefore the people came to Moses, and said, We have sinned; for we have spoken against the Lord, and against thee: pray unto the Lord, that he may take away the serpents from us. And Moses prayed for the people. And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live. And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole; and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived.* Num. 21. 5—9.

The Chaldee paraphrast applies this passage to the Messiah:—"The Lord said unto Moses, "make

[7] 1 Cor. 10. 9. Consult Whitby on this verse, where the present reading and application are defended. See also Hawker's Sermons on the divinity of Christ, p. 102.

" make thee a brazen serpent, and set it in a high " place; and it shall come to pass, that if a ser- " pent bite any one, if he looketh upon it he shall " live, if he direct his heart to the *name* of the " WORD of the LORD. And Moses made a ser- " pent of brass, and set it in a high place; and it " came to pass whensoever a serpent had bitten any " man, if he beheld the serpent of brass, and di- " rected his heart to the *name* of the WORD of the " LORD, he lived." [8]

Our Saviour himself seems to acknowledge the propriety of this application of the brazen serpent to the *name of the* WORD *of the Lord* when he says, *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the* SON OF MAN *be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.* John 3. 14, 15. And St. Paul expressly says, that it was CHRIST, who was tempted by the disobedient Jews in the wilderness. *Neither let us tempt* CHRIST, says he, *as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.* 1 Cor. 10. 9. These two applications of the history of the brazen serpent to our blessed Saviour, seem to render it morally certain, that both Christ and St. Paul understood the passage in the sense of the Chaldee paraphrast, and that the said Paraphrast, was right in his application of it to the Messiah. But if this is granted, then it will follow that CHRIST is the WORD of the LORD to whom the wounded Israelites prayed for the healing, consequently that he pre-existed his being born of the Virgin, and of course that the Socinian hypothesis is without any foundation in the holy scriptures.

This sense of the history of the brazen serpent seems confirmed by the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, where he says:—" When—they perished

[8] Targum of Jonathan.

" rished with the stings of crooked serpents, thy
" wrath endured not forever; but they were trou-
" bled for a small season, that they might be
" admonished, having a sign of salvation, to put
" them in remembrance of the commandment
" of thy law: for he that turned himself toward
" it, was not saved by the thing that he saw, but
" by *thee, who art the* SAVIOUR *of all:*—it was
" neither herb, nor mollifying plaister, that re-
" stored them to health; but *thy* WORD, *O Lord,*
" *which* HEALETH *all things.*" Wisdom 16 chap.

12. Balaam, the prophet of the Gentiles, foretels the coming of an extraordinary person:—*I shall see him, but not now: I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a* STAR *out of Jacob, and a* SCEPTRE *shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth.*[9] Num. 24. 17. These words were spoken about 1450 years before Christ, and near 900 after the flood.

13. About the same period, in all probability, is to be placed the prophetic declaration of holy Job:—*I know that my* REDEEMER *liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see* GOD: *whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.* Job 19. 25—27. If these words are spoken by the Spirit of prophecy concerning the Messiah, then it is clear he pre-existed the birth of his mother according to nature. It is probable too, that it is the same person whom he calls GOD, and declares

[9] These words are applied to Christ by all the three Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, and Jerusalem. The paraphrase is to the following effect:—" A king shall arise out of the house of Jacob, and " the Messiah shall be anointed of the house of Israel."—See Prideaux's Connection, part 2. book 8. p. 580, and Patrick upon the place.

clares he shall see him in the flesh. Every man must form a judgment according as the evidence appears unto him. Very good and able men have been on each side of the question.[1]

14. Near the time that Balaam delivered the prophecy concerning the star and sceptre, we find Moses, the man of God, foretelling the advent of a very distinguished prophet:[2] —*The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a* PROPHET *from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken.* Deut. 18. 15—19. This remarkable prophecy is applied in the Acts of the Apostles to our blessed Saviour by two infallible persons. But, as the application is not disputed, it will be unnecessary to produce it here.

15. About 1165 years before his birth, our Saviour is prophesied of by Hannah, as a victorious King. Balaam's prediction had intimated something of the same idea, by the terms *star* and *sceptre.* Hannah, however, expressly calls him a *King*: *The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces: out of heaven shall he thunder upon them; the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth, and he shall give strength unto his* KING, *and exalt the horn of his* ANOINTED.[3] 1 Sam. 2. 10. The former part of this prophecy was fulfilled about forty years afterwards,

[1] See Mr. Peters's Critical Dissertation on the book of Job, and Mr. Scott's Appendix to his Translation of the same book, No. 3. where these words are proved to be applicable to the Messiah. Dr. Durell, however, in his Critical Remarks rejects this application to the Messiah, and says that our best Commentators have justly exploded this meaning.

[2] That the ancient Jews expected their Messiah to be more than man, is evident from the saying which was common among them, "that he should be exalted above Abraham, lifted up above Moses, "and higher than the angels of the ministry."—See Patrick on the passage. See also Hervey's Theron and Aspasio, Let. 8. p. 175.

[3] This is the first time *Messiah*, or Anointed, occurs in the bible. And D. Kimchi, the famous Jewish writer, who lived towards the close of the twelfth century, ingenuously acknowledges, that "the

afterwards, as appears from the seventh chapter of the same book, and the latter part in the exaltation of Messiah to be king of the universe.

These several promises and predictions, it will be observed, are surrounded with a considerable degree of obscurity. That Messiah should be a *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King*, is sufficiently clear. And that there should be something *super-human* in his *person*, is, I think, strongly intimated; but wherein the peculiar singularity of his person should consist, was left to future revelations more fully to make known. We will proceed to them in order.

SECTION II.

Information concerning MESSIAH, from the Psalms and writings of David.

THE Psalms of David were written at different periods of his reign, about a thousand and forty years, more or less, before the birth of our Saviour. Some of them too were composed by other authors, on various occasions, but all before the birth of Christ. Several of them are undoubtedly prophetic, and foretel a variety of circumstances concerning the life, death, resurrection, ascension, and universal dominion of the Son of God. But, before we enter upon the consideration of those psalms, which predict these several circumstances, it is needful to observe, that we shall take for granted, in this investigation, the truth of every part both of the Old and New Testament; that all the Old Testament prophecies *were given by inspiration of God*, and that *holy men of God spake as they were moved by the*

" King here mentioned is the Messiah; of whom Hannah spake " either by prophecy or tradition." See Patrick on the place.

the Holy Ghost; and that the same Divine Spirit, which dictated the writings of the Old, [4] directed the minds of the Apostles and Evangelists, in their application of them in the New: consequently every prophecy of the Old, which is applied to Jesus Christ in the New, is rightly applied; is applied according to the mind of the Spirit, and the original intention of that Divine Suggester. He that suggested ideas in the former, applied those ideas in the latter, according to his own will. [5]

This

[4] "The scripture may have more senses besides the literal, because God understands all things at once; but a man's writing has but one true sense, which is that which the author meant when he writ it."

Selden's Table Talk, p. 10.

[5] "We cannot think the Jews were so void of judgment as to imagine that the Apostles, or any one else in the world, had a right to produce the simple words of the Old Testament, and to urge them in any other sense, than what was intended by the writer, directed by the Holy Ghost. It must be his sense as well as his words, that should be offered for proof to convince a reasonable man. But we see that the Jews did yield to such proofs out of scripture concerning the Messiah, in which some critics do not see the force of those arguments that were convincing to the Jews. They must then have believed, that the true sense of such places was the literal sense in regard of the Messias, whom God had then in view at his inditing of these books; and that it was not literal in respect of him, who seems at first sight to have been intended by the prophecy." Allix's Judgment, p. 50, 51.

"The writers of the N. T. frequently quote passages from the Old, either in proof of their doctrine, or to shew, that the predictions of Prophets are fulfilled. Whenever this is their point in view, the passages they quote from the O. T. must, in their literal sense, signify what they are alledged to signify. It is an inexcusable presumption in Le Clerc and other interpreters of scripture to pretend, that the Apostles cite the authority of the O. T. in the Jewish way of drawing conclusions, which in sound logic would have been rejected. If they were under the influence of the Spirit of God, we cannot suppose their writings to contain any false reasoning, however common it might be among their countrymen to argue absurdly."

Michaelis's Lect. on the N. T. sec. 11.

For a good view of the applications of the O. T. prophecies to the events of the New, see this whole section of Michaelis—Marsh's Michaelis, vol. 1. chap. 5.—Hartley's Observations on Man, vol.

This being premised, let us now proceed to examine in what manner the Psalms of David, and the following Prophetic scriptures, speak of our blessed Saviour, and how they have been applied by his Apostles and others, under the new dispensation.

16.* The second psalm is undoubtedly prophetic, and is more than once applied to *Christ* by those who can neither deceive, nor be deceived.[6] In the first, and historical sense, it unquestionably refers to king *David.* In the full, and most important sense, it received its accomplishment in king MESSIAH alone. *David* is the type, CHRIST is the antitype. What the *former* was in shadow, the *latter* was in substance. In this psalm we have various circumstances respecting the *Messiah.* 1. That he should meet with much opposition. 2. That he should be a great king. 3. That he should prevail against all his adversaries. 4. That he should be *Son of God.*[7] 5. That he should reign

2. prop. 32 and 33—Allix's Judgment, chapters 2, 3, and 4.—Dr. Randolph's Prophecies and other Texts cited in the N. T. compared with the original Hebrew and the Septuagint—See, moreover, Dr. Henry Owen's Modes of Quotation used by the Evangelical Writers explained and vindicated.

It was well spoken by Clemens Romanus—"Look, brethren, into the holy scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost. Ye know that there is nothing unjust and counterfeit written in them."

Epist. ad Corint. sect. 45.

[6] Acts 4. 25, 26;—Acts 13. 33;—Heb. 1. 5; and 5. 5.

[7] The learned Selden assures us, that "by the SON of God the Jews meant, the WORD of God, as he is called in the Chaldee Paraphrast, which was all one as to profess himself GOD."

De Jure Nat. et Gent. l. 2. c. 12.

Our learned Pocock also saith, that, "according to the sense of the ancient Jews, the SON of God, spoken of in the second Psalm, was the *eternal* SON of God, of the *same substance with the* FATHER."

Not. Miscel. ad Maim. p. 307, &c.

These two notes are taken from Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 144.

reign over all nations. 6. That all mankind must submit to him or be miserable. 7. That all who believe in the *Son* of *God*, and put their trust in him for salvation, obeying his high behests, shall assuredly be happy.

The *present* Jews deny all this, and explain the whole psalm of David alone; but the *ancient* Jews, as appears from the Targum, understood it of *Messiah*, as we Christians now do.[8] I know none but the Socinians who deny it.

17. In the eighth psalm, as applied by St. Paul, we have a prediction of the humiliation and exaltation of our blessed Saviour. Heb. 2. 6—9.

18. In the sixteenth psalm, as applied by St. Peter and St. Paul, we have a prediction of the death, resurrection, and glorification of Jesus Christ. Acts 2. 31, and 13. 35.

19. The nineteenth psalm is applied to Messiah by Justin Martyr, and the twenty first psalm by the Chaldee Paraphrast.

20. The twenty second psalm describes, in a very particular manner, the sufferings of our blessed Redeemer. There are some expressions in it which seem applicable to no other event which ever took place among men. It is quoted, or alluded to, near twenty times in the New Testament.

21. The twenty third psalm was applied to the Messiah by the ancient Jews,[9] and our Saviour himself, probably, alluded to it, when he called himself *the good shepherd who giveth his life for the sheep*. If so, then Jesus Christ is the Jehovah mentioned in the psalm.[1]

22. The

See Prideaux's Connection on this psalm; p. 2. c. 8. p. 583.—Consult also Waterland's Defence of some Queries, p. 134—163, where the question of the *Son's generation* is discussed at some length.

[8] See Allix's Judgment, p. 402, and Prideaux's Connec. p. 2. b. 8.

[9] See Allix's Judgment, p. 275 and 304.

[1] Mr. Jones, in his Catholic Doctrine, has the following argu-

22. The twenty fourth psalm was likewise applied to the Messiah by the ancient Jews,[2] and by several of the most learned of the Christian fathers. If it is rightly applied, then Christ was the *Lord of hosts*, and the *King of glory*, long before he took upon him human nature.[3] And this is the more probable, as he is unqestionably called in the New Testament, *the Lord of glory*.

23. * The fortieth psalm, as explained and applied by St. Paul, foretels the sacrifice and atonement of Christ for the sins of the world.[4] The Psalmist says,

ments upon the character of our blessed Saviour as a Shepherd; how far they are conclusive for his divinity I leave the Reader to determine:

" Ps. 23. 1. *The Lord is my* SHEPHERD.

" John 10. 16. *There shall be one fold and* ONE SHEPHERD.

" If Christ be not the Lord, in unity with the Father, there must " of course be two distinct beings, to whom the scripture has ap- " propriated this character of a *shepherd*; and that would make two " *shepherds*. But Christ has affirmed there is but *one shepherd*, and " that is himself, THE SHEPHERD *of the sheep*, v. 2. whom St. " Peter calls the *chief shepherd*. 1 Pet. 5. 4. So again—

" Ps. 100. 3. *Know ye that the Lord he is God—we are his* " *people and the* SHEEP *of* HIS *pasture*.

" John 10. 3. *He* (Christ) *calleth* HIS OWN SHEEP.

" And again—John 21. 16. *Feed* MY *sheep*, said Christ to Peter: " which, in the language of St. Peter himself. 1 Pet. 5. 2. is— " *Feed the flock of God*."

[2] See Allix's Judgment, p. 416.

[3] The Fathers who apply this psalm to the Messiah are Justin Martyr, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, and Ambrose. See Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 230.

Justin Martyr, in particular, writing on this psalm, expressly calls Christ, " GOD, and the LORD OF HOSTS."

Let it be observed here *once for all*, that, I lay no stress upon any applications of the psalms, or other prophetic scriptures, by the ancient Jews or Christians to the Messiah, unless the passages have been applied in the same manner by the writers of the New Testament, or the context itself fairly justifies the application. Such applications, however, even though erroneous, incontestibly prove, that the Ancients were warm advocates for the pre-existence and divinity of our Saviour.

[4] Ps. 40. 6—10.

says, *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required: then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart:* Thus applied by the Apostle:—*The law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure: then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. Above, when he said, Sacrifice and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offering for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein, (which are offered by the law) then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for-*

ever

ever them that are sanctified.[5] Heb. 10. 1—14.

This is a remarkable application of the words of the royal Psalmist, and never can be understood or justified, but upon the principle of a real, proper, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the world, made by the death of Christ. No man, as it seems to me, can give any other tolerable meaning to the passage. But, if this is the case, Socinianism falls to the ground. Let the Reader, however, compare the two passages together, and judge for himself.

24. The third verse of the forty third psalm is applied to Messiah by the ancient Jews; *O send out thy* LIGHT *and thy* TRUTH. In perfect conformity with this idea, our Saviour is called in the New Testament both LIGHT and TRUTH.[6]

25. * The forty fifth psalm is applied to our Saviour in the New Testament, in a manner that seems decisive for his divinity. *Thy throne, O* GOD, *is forever and ever.* St. Paul quotes the passage thus: —*But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O* GOD, *is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity: therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* Heb. 1. 8, 9.[7] Christ, therefore, is God, and the Son of God.

"It ought not to be concealed," says Dr.

[5] For an able defence of the doctrine of atonement see Veysie's eight Sermons at the Bampton Lecture.

[6] See Allix's Judgment, p. 44; John 9. 5; 14. 6. Compare Mal. 4. 2.

[7] In the word Christ, "saith Irenæus, there is understood the "*Anointer*, the *Anointed*, and the *Unction*. The *Anointer* is the "*Father*, the *Anointed* is the *Son*, and the *Unction* is the *Spirit*; as "he saith by the prophet Isaiah, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, "because he hath anointed me*; signifying the *Father* who *anointeth*, "the *Son* who is *anointed*, and the *Spirit* who is the *oil*." Lib. 3. c. 20.

Clarke, "that the words, *Thy throne, O God, is "forever and ever*, may with equal propriety, "both from the Greek and Hebrew, be also thus "rendered, *God is thy throne forever and ever*: "that is, God is the support of thy throne forever "and ever." Script. Doct. p. 77. Dr. Priestley follows Clarke in this supposition, and what the latter says *may* be the translation, the latter asserts *must* be so. These two learned Doctors may as well say, because the thing is possible, therefore a man may with equal propriety stand upon his head as his feet. They should have observed, however, that the great stream of Commentators both ancient and modern applied this passage to the Messiah according to the common acceptation. Learned men should not be so uncandid. What is it we all want but to arrive at truth, the real truth as it is in scripture?

The ancient Jews, in the Chaldee paraphrase, expressly apply this psalm to king Messiah. See the Paraphrase itself, and Prideaux's Connection, p. 2. b. 8. p. 583.

This passage too, *Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever*, is applied to the Son of God by most of the Christian fathers, in the sense here represented. See Justin Martyr's Dial. cum Tryph. p. 277. C. D. Ed. Col. 1686. Irenæus, lib. 3. c. 6. Tert. adv. Prax. c. 13. Orig. cont. Cel. p. 43. Edit. Cant. Lact. l. 4. Inst. c. 13. Euseb. Ecc. Hist. l. 1. c. 4. Lib. cont. Marc. c. 20. and Chrysost. serm. 3. ad Heb.

26. The forty seventh psalm, which is much in the same stile with the twenty fourth, is also applied to our Saviour both by the ancient Jews and Christians.[8] It appears to me, however, that no conviction can be produced in the mind from this, and

[8] See Allix's Judgment, p. 404, and Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, likewise Eusebius on the 23d. psalm.

and similar applications. We can only say, *with certainty*, they are accommodations. But yet all such accommodations, whether right or wrong, imply, that, in the judgment of the persons so applying them, the Messiah was to be a person possessed of perfections strictly divine.

27. The sixty first psalm is very particularly applied to king Messiah by the Chaldee paraphrast.

28.* The sixty eighth psalm is applied in like manner by an infallible guide:—*The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the* LORD *is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high,* THOU *hast led captivity captive;* THOU *hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the* LORD GOD *might dwell among them.* v. 17, 18. St. Paul hesitates not to apply these words unto our Saviour: —*But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore* HE *saith, when* HE *ascended up on high,* HE *led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.* Ep. 4. 7, 8. Jesus Christ, therefore, according to the application of this inspired Apostle, is the LORD GOD spoken of in the psalm. Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of this passage of scripture, says, "The Almighty God himself hath given, some apostles," &c. p. 624. ed. Ox.

And again:—"God hath given to the church, "some indeed apostles," &c. p. 234.

29. The sixty ninth psalm is descriptive of the sufferings of Christ, and is applied accordingly in several parts of the New Testament.

30.* The seventy second psalm, which prophesies of the goodness, the glory, the dominion, and the adoration of some great king, was generally understood of Messiah, both by the ancient Jews

and Christians.[9] Solomon was the type; Christ was the antitype. What the former was in figure; the latter was in reality. "The language of the "psalm itself fully demonstrates," say Justin Martyr, "that it refers only to the ETERNAL "KING, that is, to CHRIST; for, as I make it "appear from all the scriptures, CHRIST is there-"in proclaimed a KING, and a PRIEST, and "GOD, and LORD, and an ANGEL, and a MAN, "and a CAPTAIN of hosts, and a STONE, and an "INFANT; first made liable to sufferings, "thence ascending up into heaven, and again re-"turning with glory, and possessing an eternal "kingdom." Dial. cum Try. p. 251.

31. The seventy eighth psalm and fifty sixth verse, says, *They tempted and provoked the* MOST HIGH GOD, *and kept not his testimonies.* If this too is compared with 1 Cor. 10. 9, *Neither let us tempt* CHRIST, *as some of them also tempted*; will it not follow that Christ is called THE MOST HIGH GOD?

32. The eightieth psalm is uniformly applied by the ancient Jews to the Messiah.[1]

33. The eighty ninth psalm also, is understood in the same sense, both by the ancient Jews and Christians.[2] Compare Col. 1. 15, and Rev. 19. 16.

34.* The ninety seventh psalm has a passage which is applied to the Messiah in the New Testament, strongly expressive of his divinity:—*Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols: worship him, all ye gods,* v. 7th.[3] This is quoted by St. Paul in the following manner:—*And again, when he bringeth in the*

[9] See Allix's Judgment, p. 319, and 404.——See also Prideaux's Connection, p. 2. b. 8. p. 583.

[1] See Allix's Judgment, p. 270.

[2] Ibid. p. 44, 256 and 270.

[3] See Leslie's Socinian Controversy discussed, where this verse is ably defended, p. 270.

the First-begotten into the world, he saith, AND LET ALL THE ANGELS OF GOD WORSHIP HIM. Heb. 1. 6. Christ, therefore, is an object of religious homage and adoration, to all the angels in heaven, as well as to all the men upon earth.[4]

35.* Another remarkable passage, applied in the same manner, is towards the close of the 102 psalm:—*I said,* O MY GOD, *take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast* THOU *laid the foundations of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.* This fine scripture is thus applied by the same Apostle to the Son of God.—*And thou,* LORD, *in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* Heb. 1. 10—12.[5]

The application of this passage to our blessed Saviour by an inspired Apostle seems decisive for his real and proper divinity.

36.* *They lusted exceedingly in the wilderness, and tempted* GOD *in the desert.* Ps. 106. 14. If this is compared as before in similar cases with the declaration of St. Paul, *Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.* 1 Cor. 10. 9. will it not follow that Christ is the GOD who was tempted.?

37.* The

[4] Justin Martyr applies the 99th psalm also to the Messiah. See his Dial. cum. Tryp. p. 256.——[5] See Whitby on the place.

37. The hundred and tenth psalm is wholly prophetical, and is written pretty much in the spirit of the second psalm, and the sixty third chapter of Isaiah. David, under the image of a young prince, taking possession of a kingdom, and going forth to subdue all those who oppose him, foretelleth that the Messiah should be exalted to the right hand of God; should be the king and high-priest of his church; and should gloriously establish his kingdom, and triumph over all his enemies. In Mr. Green's translation, which the reader may compare with our two common ones, the whole psalm runs thus:—

" JEHOVAH said unto *my Lord*,
" Sit thou on my right hand, till I make
" Thine enemies thy footstool.
" Jehovah shall deliver *to thee*
" The sceptre of thy power out of Sion:
" Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.
" Thy people shall freely offer themselves
" On the day when thou shalt assemble thy forces
" Upon the holy hills. The youth *of* thine *army*
" Shall be like the dew from the womb of the morning.
" Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent,
" Thou art a priest forever,
" After the order of Melchizedek.
" The Lord on thy right hand, O Jehovah,
" Shall smite kings in the day of his wrath.
" He shall execute judgment among the nations;
" He shall fill *the field of battle* with dead bodies;
" He shall smite the HEAD of many countries.
" He shall drink of the brook in the way;
" Therefore shall he lift up his head.

The first verse of this prophetic composition is expressly applied by Christ to himself: *While the*

the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit, or by the Spirit, *call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto* MY *Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?* Mat. 22. 41—45.

As the three first and three last verses of the psalm predict the kingly office of Messiah, so the third predicts his priestly office, and is applied in this manner by the Apostle of the Gentiles in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

I observe too still farther upon the whole psalm, that as it has received some accomplishment in the destruction of Rome Pagan, so it is about to receive a more complete fulfilment in the destruction of Rome Christian, and all its appendages. May not the HEAD of many countries mean the Pope?

38.* *The dew of thy birth is of the womb of the morning.* Ps. 110. 3. Or, *In the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning; thou hast the dew of thy youth.* The Septuagint explains this difficult passage by rendering it, *From the womb, before the morning star I begat thee.* If this is a just translation, it strongly declares for the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, and is in the spirit of the eighth chapter of Proverbs. If it is not a just translation, yet it shews their opinion was, that Messiah existed before the foundation of the world. In either case it militates powerfully against the Socinian hypothesis.

39. The last words of this great king, spoken upwards of a thousand years before the incarnation of our blessed Saviour, are now generally understood to contain a clear prophecy of him. David lived

and

and died speaking of Jesus. But as the passage is extremely obscure in our common translation, I will lay it before the reader in a new one by the learned Mr. Green.

" Now these were the last words of David:
" David the son of Jesse saith,
" Even the man who was raised on high saith,
" The anointed of the God of Jacob,
" And the sweet psalmist of Israel.
" The Spirit of Jehovah speaketh by me,
" And his word is upon my tongue.
" The God of Israel saith,
" Even to me doth the Rock of Israel speak:
" The JUST ONE [6] ruleth over men!
" He ruleth in the fear of God.
" As the light of the morning a sun shall rise,
" A morning without clouds for brightness,
" When the tender grass after rain springeth out of the earth.
" For is not my house established with God?
" Yea, he hath made with me an everlasting covenant,
" Ordered in all things, and observed:
" Surely in him is all my salvation, and all my delight.
" Doubtless the wicked shall not flourish:
" They are all like thorns thrust away,
" Which shall not be taken by the hand,
" But the man who shall lay hold of them,
" Shall be armed with iron, and the staff of a spear,
" And they shall be utterly burned with fire.

[6] This is understood of Messiah both by the Septuagint and the Chaldee Paraphrase.

SECTION III.

Information concerning the MESSIAH, from the writings of Solomon.

40.* SOLOMON, the son of David, lived a thousand years before our Saviour, and hath left us some most invaluable writings. His fine description of wisdom, in the eighth chapter of his Proverbs, has been ascribed by all antiquity to our blessed Saviour, who is both the *wisdom and power of God,*[7] *in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.*[8] —*The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.*[9] *When there were no depths I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water.—When he prepared the heavens I was there; when he set a compass upon the face of the depth; when he established the clouds above; when he strengthened the fountains of the deep; when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment; when he appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in the habitable part of the earth: and my delights were with the sons of men.**

It should seem, I think, that this fine description of wisdom is more than a personification. The two following

N

[7] 1 Cor. 1. 24. [8] Col. 2. 3.

[9] Irenæus says, "We shew that the Word, existent in the beginning with God, united himself to the work of his own hands, when he became a man capable of suffering." Lib. 3. cap. 20.

Clemens Alexandrinus also calls the Son, "Existing or begotten without commencement."

Origen too says, "There never was duration when the Son was not; but according to the Spirit he was before all things; and time was not when he was not."

Opera Orig. Par. Edit. vol. 1. p. 483.

* Milton applies this whole description to the Son of God. Parad. Lost. b. 7. l. 8.

lowing passages from the Apocryphal books are of a similar kind, and will have a tendency to illustrate the meaning of the royal philosopher: "Wisdom, which "is the worker of all things, taught me: for in her is "an understanding spirit, holy, one only, manifold, "subtil, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to "hurt, loving the thing that is good, quick, which can-"not be letted, ready to do good, kind to man, sted-"fast, sure, free from care, having all power, oversee-"ing all things, and going through all understanding, "pure, and most subtil, spirits. For wisdom is more "moving than any motion: she passeth and goeth "through all things by reason of her pureness. For "she is the breath of the power of God, and a pure "influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty: "therefore can no defiled thing fall into her. For she "is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted "mirror of the power of God, and the image of his "goodness. And being but one, she can do all things: "and remaining in herself, she maketh all things new: "and in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh "them friends of God, and prophets. For God loveth "none but him that dwelleth with wisdom. For she is "more beautiful than the sun, and above all the order "of stars: being compared with the light, she is found "before it."

St. Paul expressly applies some part of this description to the Son of God in his most learned epistle to the Hebrews: *God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds. Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.* Ch. 1. 1—3.

Since then the description in the book of Proverbs seems to be intended of the same person or thing, with that in the Wisdom of Solomon, and seeing the latter

latter is applied in part to the Son of God by an infallible pen, we are at full liberty, I think, to apply the former to the same person.

But if the Wisdom, spoken of in such high terms by Solomon, is to be understood of the Messiah, then it will follow, that, even in the lowest sense of the description, he pre-existed, and was present with the Father at the creation of the world.

Very remarkable surely it is, and highly to be regarded, that the great stream of antiquity both Jewish [1] and Christian [2] runs in favour of this interpretation. Neither was it any part of the controversy between the Catholics and the Arians in the time of Constantine. They both agreed in the application of it to the Redeemer of men.

41.* Near the time of Solomon must be placed the words recorded in the thirtieth chapter of Proverbs:—*Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is* HIS NAME, *and what is* HIS SON'S *name, if thou canst tell?* The Creator seems to be here spoken of, and spoken of as having a *Son.* They are both spoken of too as being incomprehensible. [3]

42. *I will be to him a* FATHER, *and he shall be to me a*

 Son.

[1] See Allix's Judgment, passim.

[2] For the Fathers, see Justin Martyr's Dial. cum Tryph. p. 284, 359.—Irenæus, l. 4. cap. 7.—Athenag. p. 10. ed. Par.—Clem. Alex. p. 832.—Tertul. cont. Herm. cap. 18. cont. Prax. c. 6.—Orig. Comm. in Johan. p. 11. 17. 33. 36.—Theoph. Antioch. p. 82.—Athan. in disput. adv. Arium, p. 121.—Basil M. adv. Eunom. l. 4. p. 105.—Greg. Nyss, adv. Eunom. p. 78.—Hieron. in Prov. 8.

[3] Sommerus and Francis David, two Socinian writers of the sixteenth century, rather than grant that God has a Son, denied the authority of the book of Proverbs, and placed it among the apocryphal writings.—See Allix's Judgment, p. 428.

SON.[4] These words were spoken originally of Solomon: but they are applied both by the ancient Jews and St. Paul to the Messiah. And if God was a figurative father to Solomon, who was the type, will it not follow, that he must be a real father to Christ, who was the antitype?

43. The Song of Songs was understood by all the ancient Jews to be a book belonging to the sacred canon. They universally concurred in supposing, that it was not written on account of Solomon's marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, but in his old age, after his repentance. If this is the case, it must be considered in the light of a divine allegory, as the fifth chapter of Isaiah, and the forty fifth Psalm. Most Christian divines, I believe, have looked upon the whole as a metaphorical description of the love of Christ to his church, and of the church to Christ, her heavenly bridegroom. The apostle of the Gentiles pursues the same idea in the fifth chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians. If this observation is founded in propriety, our blessed Saviour is here called *the* ROSE OF SHARON, *and the* LILY OF THE VALLEYS—*the* CHIEF AMONG TEN THOUSAND, AND ALTOGETHER LOVELY. The whole of the poem represents him as the great object of the soul's desire. It is uniformly applied by the Chaldee paraphrase to king Messiah. Maimonides says, "The whole book is a metaphorical "discourse concerning the love of God."[5]

[4] 2 Sam. 7. 14. Compare Heb. 1. 5. See Allix's Judgment, p. 60, 61. where there is a good account of this application.

[5] Teshuba, last chap.

SECTION IV.

Information concerning the MESSIAH, from the writings of the prophets Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah.

IN the writings of the Prophets, all of whom lived some ages after Solomon, we find several passages, which strongly prove, not only the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, but that he is possessed of real and proper divinity. We will produce some of the most remarkable of them, and leave the reader to judge of the inferences which ought to be drawn from this kind of evidence.

44. The prophet Amos, who began to speak in the name of the Lord 787 years before the birth of our Saviour, makes mention of two persons that were concerned in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah: *I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt; your young men have I slain with the sword, and have taken away your horses:——I have overthrown some of you, as* GOD *overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah—yet ye have not returned unto me, saith the* LORD.[6] Ch. 4. 10, 11.

45. *The Lord God hath sworn by himself, saith the* LORD, *the* GOD OF HOSTS, *I abhor the excellency of Jacob.* Chap. 6. 8.

If nothing more is intended in the former of these passages, than that GOD destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, and in the latter, than that GOD declared he abhorred the excellency of Jacob, they seem not only uncommon, but even improper modes of speaking. In the one, JEHOVAH declares he had overthrown some of the Jewish cities,

[6] See this more at large, where we speak of Sodom and Gomorrah.

cities, as GOD overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. And in the other, the LORD, the GOD of HOSTS, tells the Prophet, that the LORD GOD had sworn by himself. Do not these expressions imply, either the existence of two Gods, or a plurality of persons in the Divine nature? or are they mere idioms of the Hebrew language?

46*. Hosea lived about 785 years before our Saviour. In his prophecy he introduces Jehovah as saying, *Call her name Lo-ruhamah: for I will no more have mercy upon the house of Israel; but I will utterly take them away. But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by* JEHOVAH THEIR GOD. Hos. 1. 7. Here is one person, who is called JEHOVAH, promises to save the house of Judah by the hand of another person, whom he calls by the name of JEHOVAH THEIR GOD.[7] This is more evident still, if we compare it with Luke 2. 11. where the Angel tells the shepherds: *Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a* SAVIOUR, *which is* CHRIST THE LORD.

47. *Afterward*

[7] It is remarkable, that the Chaldee Paraphrast understood this scripture in the manner I have here represented it:—"I will save "them by the WORD of the Lord their God." This was a well known title for the Messiah.—Novatian likewise applies the passage in the same manner:—"Why therefore," says he, "should we hesi- "tate to say that which the scripture hath not hesitated to express? "Why should true faith hesitate to believe, where the authority of "scripture is clear? For behold the prophet Hosea, speaking in the "person of the Father, *I will not save them now by bow, nor by "horses, nor by horsemen, but I will save them by the* LORD THEIR "GOD. If GOD says he will save them by GOD, and GOD doth not "save them but by CHRIST; why therefore should a man scruple "to call Christ GOD, whom he conceives to be ranked as GOD by "the Father in the scriptures? Nay, if GOD the FATHER doth not "save but by GOD, no man can be saved by GOD the FATHER, "unless he confess that Christ is GOD, in whom, and by whom, the "Father hath promised that he will give salvation: as truly every "one who acknowledges him to be GOD, will find salvation in "*Christ* who is GOD. Whosoever will not acknowledge him as

47. *Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the* LORD *their* GOD, *and* DAVID *their* KING, *and shall fear the* LORD, *and his* GOODNESS *in the latter days.* Hosea 3. 5. David is a well-known name for the Messiah, in the writings of the Prophets. May not the expression *his goodness* here be put for the Messiah? David was a type of the Messiah, who therefore is called by the name of David both here, and in several other places. In like manner John the Baptist is called Elias, because he was to resemble him, and succeed him in his office.

48. *When Israel was a child I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.*[8] Hos. 11. 1. When we read the application of this passage to Jesus Christ by St. Matthew in the New Testament, we are somewhat surprized. But the text was applied in the same manner by the ancient Jews; and Israel is called God's Son, and his First-born, in the fourth chapter of Exodus. In this respect, he was an eminent figure of the Messiah, in whom all God's promises are fulfilled.

49*. *He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with* GOD: *yea, he had power over the* ANGEL, *and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto him: he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us: even the* LORD GOD *of* HOSTS, JEHOVAH *is his memorial.*[9] It is evident from this passage, that the *Angel*, with whom Jacob wrestled in the thirty second chapter of Genesis, was the *Angel* of the covenant, who is here denominated GOD—the LORD GOD OF HOSTS—and JEHOVAH.

But

" GOD, will lose salvation, which no where else can be found but " in the GOD, *Christ.*"* See Lowth's Commentary on the place.

[8] See Allix's Judgment, p. 58, and Lowth on the place.

[9] Hosea 12. 3—5. Consult Lowth on the place, where he applies it in the same manner.

* De Trinitate, cap. 12.

But the clearest and fullest predictions of our blessed Lord, are to be found in the writings of the prophet Isaiah. He began to speak in the name of the Lord 760 years before the birth of Christ, and continued in the prophetic office near 60 years. We will consider a few passages of his book, which relate to the *person* and *office* of our blessed Saviour, in the order in which they are found in his writings.

50. *Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?* Is. 2. 22. A valuable author hath observed upon this passage, that it denotes the divinity of Messiah. For, says he, "although commentators take no "notice of it, hath it not an eye to the divinity "of Christ, warning us not to look upon him "as a mere man? For, as such, how could he "possibly save us, or even himself? Were he no "more than other men, a mortal man only, *whose* "*breath is in his nostrils*, we might well say, "*Wherein is he to be accounted of?* That of the "Psalmist would be as applicable to him, as to "others; *None can by any means redeem his bro-* "*ther, nor give to God a ransom for him; for it* "*cost more to redeem their souls: therefore must he* "*let that alone forever.*[1] But Christ hath redeemed his brethren; therefore he is more than "man, even God as well as man; true God, and "true man, in one person, never to be divided."[2]

51.* *The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a* VIRGIN *shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall*[3] *call*

[1] Ps. 49. 7, 8.

[2] Wogan's Essay on the Proper Lessons, vol. 1. p. 33, 34.—Novatian justly observes, "If Christ is only a man, why is our hope "put in him, seeing hope in man is pronounced accursed?" De Trin. c. 13 and 14. See Jeremiah 17. 5.

[3] To be called is the same in scripture-phrase as to be. When, therefore, our Saviour was to be called *Emmanuel*, it means that he should really and truly be, what that name imported, namely, God

call his name EMMANUEL. Is. 7. 14. This mysterious portion of holy scripture, is abundantly cleared up with respect to the fact, though not with regard to the mode of that fact, in the history of our Saviour's birth:—*Behold, a* VIRGIN *shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name* EMMANUEL, *which, being interpreted, is,* GOD WITH US. Mat. 1. 18-23. See the whole passage.

52.* *Sanctify the* LORD OF HOSTS HIMSELF; *and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.* ch. 8. 13, 14, 15.

This is applied to Christ by St. Peter: *The stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a* STONE *of* STUMBLING, *and a* ROCK *of* OFFENCE, *even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed.* 1 Peter 2. 7, 8. See also Rom. 9. 33. where it it is applied in the same manner.—Hence it should seem, that Christ, in his divine nature, is the LORD OF HOSTS HIMSELF.[4]

53.* This idea will be confirmed by that celebrated prophecy in the ninth chapter:—*Unto us a child*

O *is*

WITH US—GOD in human nature—GOD and MAN in one mediator. See Dr. Lowth on the place. In the eighth verse of the eighth chapter the land of Judea is named the land of EMMANUEL seven centuries before he was born; which seems to imply, in conformity with various other passages, that he was at that time the real, though invisible, *King* of the Jews. St. John explains the whole:—*He came unto his own nation, and his own people received him not.* John 1. 11.

[4] This passage is ascribed in the Targum to the WORD of the Lord.

is born, unto us a son is given; and the governe ment shall be upon his shoulder; and his nam- shall be called, WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER,[5] THE PRINCE OF PEACE.[6]

This passage is extremely important; and they who deny the divinity of our blessed Saviour are greatly distressed with it. They have various ways of reconciling it with the idea of his mere humanity; but one of the most common, is, by denying the justness of our translation. To put the matter, therefore, out of all dispute, and to give the unlearned reader every possible satisfaction, we will set down several translations, that they may have it in their power to judge for themselves. And we will not alter the words, though it will make them bald English, that every person may see what ground there is for saying that our common translation is wrong.

The Hebrew then is thus: "*For a Man Child* "*is born to us, a Son is given to us, and shall be* "*the Rule upon his Shoulder, and shall be called* "*his Name, Wonderful, Counsellor, God, Mighty,* "*Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace.*"

The Chaldee Paraphrase: "*A Man Child is* "*born to us, a Son is given to us, and he shall take* "*the Law upon him, that he may keep it, and his* "*Name shall be called from the face of the admi-* "*rable Council, God, a Man enduring to Eternity,* "*Christ, whose Peace shall be multiplied upon us* "*in his days.*"

Syriac:

[5] Irenæus says, probably in allusion to this expression, that "the "WORD of GOD is the FATHER of mankind." Lib. 4. cap. 51.

[6] Is. 9. 6. That the ancient Jews applied this remarkable passage of the Prophet to the Messiah, see Allix's Judgment, p. 44.— That part of the prophecy too, which is contained in the following verse, is applied by the angel Gabriel to Jesus Christ, before he was born. Compare Is. 9. 7. with Luke 1. 31 and 32.

The Christian Fathers also, uniformly applied this whole passage to Jesus Christ in the manner we usually do now. Justin Martyr

Syriac: "*A Child is born to us, a Son is given* "*to us, and his Empire is made upon his Shoulder,* "*and his Name is called Admiration, and Coun-* "*sellor, the most mighty God of Ages, the Prince* "*of Peace, of whose Principality to Plenty and* "*Peace, there shall be no bound.*"

Arabic: "*A Man Child his born to us, a Son* "*is given to us, whose Dominion is upon his Shoul-* "*ders, and his Name shall be called, the Angel of* "*great Council, the admirable Counsellor, the* "*strong God, the Emperor, the Lord of Peace, the* "*Father of the Age to come.*"

Greek: "*A young Child is born to us, a Son is* "*given to us, the Government of whom is upon his* "*Shoulder, and his Name shall be called, The An-* "*gel of the great Council, wonderful Counsellor,* "*the Mighty, the Governour, the Prince of Peace,* "*the Father of the Age to come.*" [7]

The Latin, French, and other translations are

quotes not the passage entire indeed, in any one place, but he calls the Messiah, "THE MIGHTY GOD, who is to be adored, and the "*Angel of the great council.*" See his Works, passim.—Irenæus tells us, from the same Prophet, that, "his name should be called "WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD.—He is "THE MIGHTY GOD, and hath an ineffable extraction." See book 4. ch. 66.—Clemens Alexandrinus cites the text in the follow-manner:—"WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER.

Dionysius Alexandrinus quotes the text thus:—"He proclaims "him THE MIGHTY GOD, the God who is a child." Epist. cont. Paul. Samos. p. 852. Labb.—St. Cyprian has it thus:—"Behold, "*to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government shall* "*be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called,* WONDERFUL, "COUNSELLOR." Test. against the Jews, chap. 21.—Athanasius thus:—"*His name shall be called,* THE ANGEL OF THE GREAT "COUNCIL, WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, *the* MIGHTY GOD, "*the* GOVERNOUR, *the* PRINCE OF PEACE, *the* FATHER OF "THE FUTURE AGE." De Incarn. cont. Arian. cap. 22.—The elder Cyril thus:—"*His name shall be called,* THE ANGEL "OF THE GREAT COUNCIL OF THE FATHER, WONDERFUL, "COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD." &c.

[7] The Greek copies differ very considerably upon this verse.

are all to the same purpose, with very little variation.

will lay before the Reader the remarks of the learned Dr. Waterland upon it:—"The Seventy, as Jerome remarks, in rendering Is. "9. 6. have took a very unusual freedom. For, thinking it "strange and harsh to apply the name of *God*, and *mighty*, &c. "to a person just before called a *child*, they chose rather to vary the "sense, and to make a comment, instead of a translation, put-"ting, *Angel of the great council*, instead of those other higher titles "and epithets. But, most probably the fault lay not in the Seventy "interpreters, but in the Jews, who after Christ's time, had cor-"rupted some copies of the Seventy. Certain it is, that Irenæus, "who was a professed admirer and follower of the version of the "Seventy, looking upon it as an inspired performance, yet "quotes not this text of Isaiah according to the Septuagint, as it "now is, or as it was, in some copies at least, in the time St. Je-"rome, Eusebius, and even Justin Martyr; but according to what "it should be, and as it lies in the Hebrew text; citing it in proof "of the divinity of Christ. In like manner Clemens of Alexan-"dria, though equally an admirer of the Septuagint version, yet "cites the same text of Isaiah, much after the same sense with "Irenæus, and not according to the Seventy; drawing an argument "from thence of the greatness, majesty, and essential divinity of "the Son of God. It is the less to be wondered at, if afterwards "we but seldom meet with this text cited in proof of Christ's divi-"nity, since the Septuagint, which the primitive Fathers chiefly "followed and quoted from, exhibited another sense of the passage. "Yet we find it cited by Athanasius, if the piece concerning the "Incarnation be his, and the Elder Cyril, for that purpose: and "there the verse is cited according to the Hebrew original; only "taking in part of the Seventy's translation: from whence one "might suspect that there had been two versions of the same "words, and both, by degrees, taken in to the text, and tacked to-"gether." Eight Sermons, p. 219.

We will add to these observations of the learned Waterland those of Dr. Apthorp:—"The Arabic version," says he, "is formed on "the Seventy, which in the Vatican copy is thus expressed: *Unto* "*us a child is born, unto us a son is given, his government shall be* "*upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called, The Angel of the* "*great council—for I will bring peace upon his governours, and* "*health to him.* This is evidently a mutilated passage, as appears "from the Vulgate and Arabic; and from the more ample Greek "version in the Alexandrian Manuscript."*—See the Greek version above.—"Not even this version hath escaped entire: for I have no "doubt, that the genuine reading was, *Mighty God*, and that the "word *God* was left out either by design, or because of the similar

* Discourses on Prophecy, vol. 1. p. 177, 178.

variation. I will close them with the late venerable bishop Lowth's:

" *For unto us a Child is born; unto us a Son is* " *given; and the government shall be upon his* " *shoulder: and his name shall be called, Wonder-* " *ful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the Father of the* " *everlasting age, the Prince of peace.*"

How little is gained by rejecting our present translation, even the unskilful in language will hence be competent to judge.[s]

The chief objection to this passage, is, the phrase *Mighty God.* This is supposed to be inconsistent with the character of Messiah. But when it is considered, that the prophet Isaiah was more fully enlightened into the character of Jesus than ordinary, that the New Testament has several expressions

" ending in ισχυρος like the usual contraction in that manu-
" script ΘC. for the Vulgate has, ADMIRABILIS, CONSILIA-
" RIUS, DEUS, FORTIS, PATER FUTURI SECULI, PRIN-
" CEPS PACIS. I the rather suspect fraud and ill faith in omit-
" ting Θεος, because, though so essential a word is the un-
" doubted reading of the Hebrew text, it is omitted by A. Σ. Θ.
" whose versions are represented in Montfaucon's Hexapla, II. 103.
" The word Θεος is in the Ald. and Compl. LXX. and Deus,
" in the Latin of Irenæus, IV. 66.

" Eusebius, D. E. p. 336. gives the Greek version uncorrupt-
" ed, WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, MIGHTY GOD.

" The very learned Mr. Woide of the British Museum obliging-
" ly pointed out to me a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus, Pædag.
" 1. 5. which confirms my suspicion of fraud in suppressing Θεος
" in the Greek translations. The passage of St. Clement is wor-
" thy to be transcribed entire. Edit. Potteri, p. 112. What is
" therefore this infant boy, after whose image we are children? By
" the same prophet he declares his greatness: WONDERFUL,
" COUNSELLOR, MIGHTY GOD, EVERLASTING FATHER,
" PRINCE OF PEACE: *of the increase of his government and peace*
" *there shall be no end.* O GREAT GOD! O PERFECT CHILD!
" the SON in the FATHER, and the FATHER in the SON."

[s] For these translations from the several languages of the East, see Leslie's Dialogues on the Socinian controversy.

expressions equally strong, and that the Jews always admitted it, till the Septuagint translation was made, I do not see why, even a priori, we should hesitate in adopting the expression in all its extent. [9]

54.* *And there shall come forth a* ROD *out of the stem of Jesse, and a* BRANCH *shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of courage and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord: and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears.* Is. 11. 1—3. We Christians understand this whole chapter of the Messiah. The ancient Jews did the same, as appears from their Targum on the first and sixth verses. It is remarkable also, that in the tenth verse Messiah is called the ROOT of Jesse, though not born till upwards of a thousand years after him. This root of Jesse, was to stand for an ensign of the people, and to it should the Gentiles seek. This is applied by St. Paul to our Saviour, and he tells us the Gentiles should *trust* in him. Rom. 15. 12. Compare Mat. 12. 21, and Jer. 17. 5. In this last passage a curse is pronounced on *the man who trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm.* Does not this imply something in the nature of Christ superior, at least, to mere humanity? If we are to trust in Christ, and if *cursed*

[9] The translation of Lowth has been animadverted upon by a Mr. Dodson in a new version of this Prophet; and he has taken the liberty of altering the text of this important passage to get clear of the doctrine it contains. His disingenuous conduct herein has been animadverted upon by Dr. Sturges in a small pamphlet entitled, Short Remarks on a new translation of Isaiah, which the learned reader may do well to consult. The substance of his criticism upon this passage may be found in the Monthly Review for March 1792, p. 30.

cursed be the man that trusteth in man, then Christ, in whom we are to trust, must be more than man.

55. *In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty unto the residue of his people.* Is. 28. 5. The Targum renders this—"In that day the MESSIAS of the Lord of "hosts shall be crowned with joy." For JEHOVAH, in the original, it substitutes MESSIAS. It is evident from this, and many other passages, that the ancient Jews found Christ in a variety of places of the Old Testament, where we should scarce expect to meet with him.[1] He was then their glory and joy, and they were glad to discover the smallest traces of his footsteps. Why should we Christians be more shy of him? I would not sacrifice my understanding to a mere imaginary interpretation; but neither would I reject a meaning that gives dignity to the scriptures, if there is any probability of its having been in the mind of the Spirit.—At all events, such interpretations give us a very satisfactory view of the opinions of the ancient Jews concerning their Messiah.

56. *Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.* ch. 28. 16. This passage is applied to Christ several times in the New Testament, and was understood of the Messiah also by the ancient Jews, as appears from the Targum upon the place. To this St. Paul, probably, alludes when he says, *Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.*

57.* *Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not: behold* YOUR GOD *will come with vengeance,*

[1] See Jamieson's Vindication, vol. 1. p. 83.

vengeance, EVEN GOD *with a recompence; he will come, and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.* Is. 35. 3—5.

Our Saviour expressly applies this prophecy to himself, and closes it with saying, *Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me.* Mat. 11. 2—6. Christ therefore is the God that should come with a recompence.

58.* *The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of* JEHOVAH, *make straight in the desert a high-way for* OUR GOD. *Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of* JEHOVAH *hath spoken it.* Is. 40. 3—5. Compare Mark 1. 3.

In this passage, like that in Hosea, are evidently two JEHOVAHS made mention of.

59* *O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high mountains: O thou that tellest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength: lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah,* BEHOLD YOUR GOD! *Behold, the* LORD GOD *will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him.* Chap. 40. 9, 10. Compare this passage with Rev. 22. 12. *Behold, I come quickly, and* MY *reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.* What is said of the LORD GOD in the former of these scriptures, is expressly declared of himself by our Saviour in the latter; it should seem, therefore, that JESUS CHRIST is the LORD GOD spoken of by the Prophet.

60.* *He*—THE LORD GOD—*shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and*

and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young. Ch. 40. 11. The shepherd in this verse, who is called THE LORD GOD in the context, seems to be no other than *the* GOOD SHEPHERD, *who gave his life for the sheep.* See the tenth chapter of St. John's gospel.

61.* *Thus saith the* LORD, *the* KING *of Israel, and his* REDEEMER, *the* LORD *of* HOSTS; *I am the* FIRST, *and I am the* LAST; *and besides me there is no* GOD. Ch. 44. 6.—Compare Rev. 1. 8. *I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* BEGINNING *and the* ENDING, *saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.*—Again:—*I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* FIRST *and the* LAST. Rev. 1. 11.—Also Rev. 22. 13. I AM ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* BEGINNING *and the* END, *the* FIRST *and the* LAST.

From these comparisons it appears, that Jesus Christ is Isaiah's LORD, KING of Israel, and LORD of HOSTS, the FIRST and the LAST.

62. *Thus saith the Lord, The labour of Egypt, and merchandise of Ethiopia, and of the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine, they shall come after thee, in chains they shall come over; and they shall fall down unto thee, they shall make supplication unto thee, saying, Surely God is in thee, and there is none else, there is no God. Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour.* Ch. 45. 14, 15. This passage is usually applied to Jesus Christ by the Fathers of the primitive church;[2] though the first part of the passage, I think, is applicable to Cyrus only, or to the church.

63.* *Look unto* ME *and be ye saved, all the ends of the*

 earth;

[2] See Tert. adv. Prax. c. 13.—Cyp. adv. Jud. l. 2. c. 6.—Hippol. cont. Noet. sect. 4.—Patres Syn. Ant. adv. Paul. Samos. —and others.

earth; for I am GOD, *and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every* KNEE *shall* BOW, *every tongue shall swear.* Ch. 45. 22, 23.—Compare Rom. 14. 9—12. *To this end* CHRIST *both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be* LORD *both of the dead and living.—For we must all stand before the judgment-seat of* CHRIST. *For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every* KNEE *shall* BOW *to* ME, *and every tongue shall confess unto* GOD.—Also in another place—*At the name of* JESUS *every* KNEE *shall* BOW. Phil. 2. 10.

Every person will draw the conclusion for himself. See Lowth's Commentary on this passage, where it is applied in the same manner.

64.* *Surely shall one say, In* JEHOVAH *have I righteousness and strength: even to* HIM *shall men come, and all that are incensed against* HIM *shall be ashamed. In* JEHOVAH *shall all the seed of Israel be* JUSTIFIED, *and shall* GLORY. Ch. 45. 24, 25. This declaration of the Prophet seems well explained by that of the Apostle:—*Of him are ye in* CHRIST JESUS, *who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that* GLORIETH, *let him glory in the* LORD. 1. Cor. 1. 30, 31. Is it not a fair conclusion from this comparison, that CHRIST is the JEHOVAH spoken of by the Prophet? I think it is. Nor can this conclusion be honestly evaded.

65.* *How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion,* THY GOD REIGNETH. Ch. 52. 7. This remarkable scripture is applied to Jesus Christ by St. Paul, Rom. 10. 15. It was applied also to the Messiah by both the ancient

ent Jews,[3] and Christians.[4] It follows, therefore, of course, that CHRIST is the GOD *who* REIGNETH, in the language of the Prophet; not, surely, independent of his Father, but with him, as a son with a father. *All power*, says he, *is given unto me in heaven and in earth.*

66.* This Prophet's wonderful prediction of our Saviour's sufferings, and consequent glory, must not be passed over here without notice. And as there are some parts of it obscure in our version, I will transcribe it in bishop Lowth's new translation:

" Behold, my servant shall prosper;
" He shall be raised aloft, and magnified, and very highly exalted.
" As many were astonished at him;
" (To such a degree was his countenance disfigured, more than that of man;
" And his form, more than the sons of men;)
" So shall he sprinkle many nations,
" Before him shall kings shut their mouths;
" For what was not before declared to them, they shall see,
" And what they had not heard, they shall attentively consider.
" Who hath believed our report;
" And to whom hath the arm of Jehovah been manifested?
" For he groweth up in their sight like a tender sucker;
" And like a root from a thirsty soil:
" He hath no form, nor any beauty, that we should regard him;
" Nor is his countenance such, that we should desire him.
" Despised, nor accounted in the number of men;
" A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;
" As one that hideth his face from us:
" He was despised, and we esteemed him not.
" Surely our infirmities he hath borne:
" And our sorrows, he hath carried them:
" Yet we thought him judicially stricken;
" Smitten

[3] See Allix's Judgment, p. 33.——[4] See do. p. 36.

" Smitten of God, and afflicted.
" But he was wounded for our transgressions;
" Was smitten for our iniquities:
" The chastisement, by which our peace is effected, was laid upon him;
" And by his bruises we are healed.
" We all of us like sheep have strayed;
" We have turned aside, every one to his own way;
" And Jehovah hath made to light upon him the iniquity of us all.
" It was exacted, and he was made answerable, and he opened not his mouth:
" As a lamb that is led to the slaughter,
" And as a sheep before her shearers,
" Is dumb; so he opened not his mouth.
" By an oppressive judgment he was taken off;
" And his manner of life who would declare?
" For he was cut off from the land of the living;
" For the transgression of my people he was smitten to death.
" And his grave was appointed with the wicked;
" But with the rich man was his tomb.
" Although he had done no wrong,
" Neither was there any guile in his mouth;
" Yet it pleased Jehovah to crush him with affliction.
" If his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice,
" He shall see a seed, which shall prolong their days,
" And the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall prosper in his hands.
" Of the travail of his soul he shall see the fruit and be satisfied:
" By the knowledge of him shall my servant justify many;
" For the punishment of their iniquities he shall bear.
" Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion;
" And the mighty people shall he share for his spoil:
" Because he poured out his soul unto death;
" And was numbered with the transgressors:
" And he bore the sin of many;
" And made intercession for the transgressors.

That

That the Prophet speaks of Christ in this whole passage, no Christian can reasonably doubt, there being scarce a verse in the whole that is not by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament applied to him. And though the latter Jews will not allow of this application, yet some of them not only do own, that their ancient Rabbins did with one mouth confess these words were spoken of Messiah the King; but also speak thus of him:—"The holy, blessed God began to covenant with the Messiah when he created him, and said to him, The sins of those who are laid up in secret with thee, will make thee to come under an iron yoke, and make thee like to this young heifer, whose eyes are dim, and fill thy spirit with anguish; and because of their iniquities thy tongue shall cleave to the roof of thy mouth: Wilt thou then undergo this condition for them?

"The Messiah said, I undertake it with the joy and exultation of my heart, on this condition, That not one of Israel may perish, and that not only they may be saved who live in my days, but also they who are dead from the days of the first man to this very day. And again, when God created the world, he held forth his hand under the throne of glory, and created the soul of the Messiah, and his company, and said to him, Wilt thou head and redeem my sons after six thousand years? He answered him, Yes. God said to him, If so, wilt thou bear chastisements to expiate their iniquities, according to what is written, Is. 53. 4. *Surely he bore our griefs?* He answered, I will endure them with joy." Whence three things are observable:

1. The Jews were acquainted with the Father's covenant,

covenant with Messiah concerning his sufferings for the sins of the people.

2. They believed their Messiah was to suffer for their sakes, to make atonement for their sins.

3. He was to be the salvation of all from the beginning to the end of time.[5]

67. *Thy* MAKER *is thine husband, the* LORD *of* HOSTS *is his name.* Ch. 54. 5.—Compare this with John 3. 29. *He that hath the bride is the bridegroom.*

If the *Lord* of *hosts* is the husband of the church: if *Christ* also is the bridegroom of the church: and if the church cannot have two husbands: will it not follow that *Christ* is the *Lord* of *hosts?*

68. *Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people.* Is. 55. 4. Part of this chapter is applied by St. Paul to Jesus Christ in the 13 chapter of Acts, and the ancient Jews understood the whole of the Messiah.[6]

69.* *Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?*

I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.

Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat?

I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury, and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none

to

[5] See Whitby on Acts 8. verse 32.

The Targum of Jonathan interprets this description of the sufferings of Christ, as we Christians do. See Prideaux's Connection, part 2. b. 8. p. 581, 582.

[6] See Allix's Judgment, p. 55.

to help; and I wondered there was none to uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me, and my fury it upheld me. And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth. Ch. 63. 1—5.

This remarkable scripture is applied to our blessed Saviour by the best Commentators, and is expressive, not only of his pre-existence, but also of his more than human power. Language like this ill becomes a mere mortal man, especially a man of the meek and lowly character of the Messiah.

It is the more likely that this passage is applicable only to the Messiah, because all the three persons of the Divine Nature are expressly mentioned in the following part of the chapter. Messiah is called *the* ANGEL *of God's presence*, and the people are said to have *rebelled and vexed his* HOLY SPIRIT, which he had put within them. Messiah, therefore, may well be supposed to be the person introduced in the above sublime dramatic representation. [7]

70. *I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people.* [8] Ch. 65. 1, 2. This passage is most commonly applied by the Christian fathers to our Saviour. If it is justly applied, it will prove him to be the GOD who spake the words.

Micah,

[7] See Knight's Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, where this meaning is ably vindicated, p. 172—186. Consult Lowth's Commentary on the place, and his observations on the 9th verse, *The Angel of his presence saved them*, where he speaks of the appearances of Christ before his incarnation. See too bishop Lowth's notes. This learned Prelate applies it in the same manner.

[8] See Knight's Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, p. 186—196

Micah, the prophet, who lived upwards of 700 years before the birth of our Saviour, foretold, not only the place of his birth, but his pre-existence, and eternal generation:

71.* *But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel*; WHOSE GOINGS FORTH *have been from of* OLD, FROM EVERLASTING. Ch. 5. 2. This remarkable passage was always applied to Messiah by the ancient Jews, as well as the Christian fathers, and it contains a full and satisfactory proof of his pre-existence, and a probable proof, at least, of his *eternal* existence. [9]

[9] I add too, that in ch. 2. 13, it is probably Messiah, who is called KING JEHOVAH.—The Chaldee Paraphrase has this text thus:—"Whose name was said from eternity, from the days of the "age."——The Syriac:—"Whose going forth is from the be-"ginning, from the eternal days."—— The Arabic:—"Whose "out-goings in Israel are from everlasting days."——The Greek:—"And his goings forth from the beginning, from the days of "eternity."

The Jews couple this phrase, and that in Ps. 72. 17,—*His name shall be continued as long as the sun*—together, and say,—"His "name was *Son* before the sun was made;" and understand both of the Messiah. See bishop Chandler's Defence of Christianity, p. 153, and Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 239, 240.

Bishop Newcome translates the phrase:—*And his goings forth have been from of old, from the days of hidden ages.*

See Prideaux's Connection, part 2. b. 8. p. 582, and Lowth upon the place.

SECTION V.

Information concerning the MESSIAH, from Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Joel, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.

JEREMIAH began to prophesy 630 years before Christ, and continued in that office upwards of 40 years. The person and character of our Saviour are the objects of at least two of his predictions. But there is one place in his book, by which, when compared with others, we may, indirectly, be assured, that Messiah should be more than man. I will quote it at large.

72.* *Thus saith the Lord*; CURSED *be the man that* TRUSTETH IN MAN, *and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord; for he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land and not inhabited. Blessed is the man that trusteth in the* LORD, *and whose hope the* LORD *is; for he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green, and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit.* Jeremiah 17. 5—9. The general tenor of scripture is, that we should trust in CHRIST. Here is a curse denounced upon every one who trusteth in MAN. CHRIST, therefore, is more than *mere man*, or the scripture issues contradictory injunctions.

The two predictions concerning the person and character of our Saviour, just mentioned, are very remarkable, and of considerable importance in the controversy on the dignity of Messiah. It will be needful to produce them both.

73.* The first runs thus:—*Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a* RIGHTEOUS BRANCH, *and a* KING *shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called,* THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Ch. 23. 5, 6.

74. The second thus:—*In those days, and at that time, will I cause the* BRANCH OF RIGHTEOUSNESS *to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely, and this is the name wherewith he shall be called,* THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Ch. 33. 16.

The former of these passages is decisive in favour of the divinity of our blessed Saviour, if we admit of the present translation. But then we are told by a learned man, that the vulgar rendering is not accurate, and that it ought to be translated—*This is the name by which Jehovah shall call him, Our Righteousness.* Now, it appears to me, that there are some substantial reasons for supposing, that our translation is the only just one, and that no other can be supported without doing violence both to the text and context. The text is,

וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו׃

Our Bible-translation is, *And this is his name whereby he shall be called,* THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Dr. Blayney gives the above new translation, and then he adds the following note:—" I doubt not but " some persons will be offended with me for depriving " them by this translation of a favourite argument for " proving the divinity of our Saviour from the Old " Testament. But I cannot help it: I have done it " with no ill design, but purely because I think, and " am morally sure, that the text, as it stands, will not " properly admit of any other construction. The Seventy

" Seventy have so translated before me, in an age " when there could not possibly be any bias of pre- " judice either for or against the before mentioned " doctrine; a doctrine which draws its decisive proof " from the New Testament only. In the parallel passage, " Ch. 33. 16, the expression is a little varied, but the " sense according to a just and literal translation is pre- " cisely the same:—*And this is he whom Jehovah shall* " *call*, OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

Our translation of this parallel text is nearly the same as that of the former. The original is—

זה אשר יקרא לו יהוה צדקנו׃

The translation: *This is the name wherewith* SHE *shall be called*, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. This is the parallel place, and might properly be rendered—This is the name wherewith *he* shall be called, not *she*, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

It is remarkable, however, that the Septuagint favours Dr. Blayney's new translation, and that the original Hebrew will admit either of the new or old. This being the case, and the Septuagint favouring the new one, is a very considerable circumstance in its favour. Their words are:—Και τουτο το ονομα αυτω, ὁ καλεσει αυτον Κυριος, Ιωτσεδεκ—*And this is the name of him, which the Lord shall call him*, RIGHTEOUSNESS.

But I have an objection to placing an implicit confidence in this Greek translation, more especially on the Prophets. For in that famous passage, Is. 9. 6. *Unto us a child is born*, &c. some of the copies of that version miserably maim and curtail the text, while the original, and several of the other translations preserve the place entire.[1] It appears to me, that not being able to conceive,

[1] " The Septuagint version of Isaiah is not so old as that of the " Pentateuch by a hundred years and more; having been made in " all probability after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.—And it " unfortunately happens, that Isaiah has had the hard fate to " meet with a Translator very unworthy of him, there being hardly " any book of the Old Testament so ill rendered in that version as

conceive, how such high titles should belong to Messiah, the translator of that book has taken the liberty of abridging, or curtailing them, and has left only such as were agreeable to his own ideas of Messiah's character. But this, the reader will observe, is *making* scripture, and not *translating* it. A translator has no right to deviate from the original, nor to represent things otherwise than as they really are in the copy.

All the other translations of this passage are favourable to ours.—The Vulgate has it: And this is the name which they shall call him, THE LORD OUR JUST ONE.

The Syriac: And this is his name by which they shall call him, The LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

The Arabic: And that is the name by which they shall name him, *The* LORD RIGHTEOUSNESS.

The Chaldee Paraphrase differs somewhat from them all: This is his name by which they shall call him, *Righteousness shall be to us from before the Lord in his days.*

From the above considerations on the Septuagint, and a comparison of all these other translations with the original Hebrew text, I conclude that our common rendering is the only true and legitimate one.

Besides; it is extremely probable, that the Jews should understand their own phraseology as well or better than we can understand it for them at this distance of time. And we do not find that they translated this phrase, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS, in any other way than we do;[2] only they explained it away, as they do all the other scriptures which affect their views of the Messiah. Nay, they are so far from varying from our vulgar translation of the passage in question, that they expressly say the name of the Messiah was to be JEHOVAH

" this of Isaiah. Add to this, that the version of Isaiah, as well as " other parts of the Greek version, is come down to us in a bad con- " dition, incorrect, and with frequent omissions and interpolations."
Bishop Lowth's Prelim: Dissert. to Isaiah p. 66.

[2] See Allix's Judgment, p. 408.

VAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.[3] This is so clear and satisfactory, that even Socinus himself could not deny the propriety of the translation, though, like the Jews, he evaded the force of it, though in a different way.

Our translation is, moreover, greatly strengthened by having recourse to the context, which appears to me highly to favour our vulgar rendering. For it is the Lord Almighty, the Father of our Lord, who is speaking, and speaking only of the righteous Branch, describing him, and telling how he shall be called. *Behold, the days come,* SAITH THE LORD, *that I will raise unto David a* RIGHTEOUS BRANCH, *and a* KING *shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby* HE *shall be called,* THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. It is the Lord himself who speaks, and not the Prophet, and tells us what the name of this king should be whom he was about to raise up for the salvation of his people. His

[3] Let the Reader by all means consult the excellent Bishop Pearson on the Creed, p. 148, 149, where this is proved with great ability. He says the Jews constantly attribute the name *Jehovah* to the *Messiah* from this one particular text: as in the Sepher Ikkarim, l. 2. c. 8. ויקרא הכתוב שם המשיח יי צדקנו, The Scripture calleth the name of the Messias, Jehovah our Righteousness. And in Midrasch Tillim on Ps. 21.

צדקנו וקורא למלך המשיח בשמי ומהו שמו יהוה שנ יהוה יהוה שמו ובמלך המשיח כתיב וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה איש מלחמה

God calleth the Messiah by his own name, and his name is Jehovah; as it is said, Ex. 15. 3. *The Lord is a man of war, Jehovah is his name.* And it is written of the Messiah, Jer. 23. 6, *And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness.* Thus Echa Rabati, Lam. 1. 6. שנ וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו מה שמו של משיח אל אבא יהוה שמו—What is the name of the Messias? R. Abba said, Jehovah is his name; as it is said, Jer. 23. 6. *And this is the name which they shall call him,* JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. The same he reports of Rabbi Levi. —See the whole note for a defence of this interpretation against the Socinians.

His name should be, and his nature should correspond with his name, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

It ought not to be forgotten too, that this view of the passage is more agreeable to all the parallel scriptures. *Surely shall one say, In* JEHOVAH *have I* RIGHTEOUSNESS AND STRENGTH: *even to him shall men come: and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In* JEHOVAH *shall all the seed of Israel be* JUSTIFIED, *and shall* GLORY.[4] Are these words applicable to any other but JESUS CHRIST? If not, then JESUS CHRIST is the JEHOVAH in whom we have RIGHTEOUSNESS and STRENGTH. HE *is the end of the law for* RIGHTEOUSNESS *to every one that believeth,*[5] *—being made of God unto us wisdom,* RIGHTEOUSNESS, *sanctification, and redemption: that according as it is written,* HE *that* GLORIETH *let him* GLORY *in the* LORD.[6] Compare 2 Cor. 5. 21.

From all these considerations I conclude, that our vulgar translation of this text is the only just one, and that it contains an unanswerable argument for the divinity of our blessed Saviour, at least so far as the application of the term JEHOVAH is a proof of that divinity. The candid reader will weigh the reasons here produced, and judge according to evidence.[7]

Ezekiel

[4] Is. 45. 24, 25.—[5] Rom. 10. 4.

[6] 1 Cor. 1. 30, 31.

[7] Consult the Appendix to Dr. Eveleigh's two Sermons on the Trinity.——" Jer. 23. 5. 6. relates to the Messias in the judgment " of all the ancient Jews. Our Socinians will not allow this; but " rather than own that the Messias is named God, they refer the " title of, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS, to the people there " spoken of."

Allix's Judg. p. 418.

Consult Lowth's Commentary on the place, where he says, " Messiah shall be what his name imports. He shall be JEHOVAH, " or the true GOD, and *our righteousness*, or the means of our jus- " tification.—The title of JEHOVAH is elsewhere given to the " Messiah by the Prophets: See Is. 40. 10; 48. 17; Hos. 1. 7. " Zech. 2. 10, 11; Mal. 3. 1." Consult for the Jewish application of Jehovah our righteousness to Messiah, Martini Pugio Fidei, p. 517; and Jamieson's Vindication, vol. 1. p. 81, 82.

Ezekiel prophesied in Babylon while Jeremiah did the same in Judea. He has spoken sparingly of the person of Jesus, but yet he is not altogether silent concerning him.

75. *I will set up one Shepherd over my flock, and he shall feed them, even my servant David: he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them: I the Lord have spoken it.* And—*I will raise up for them a Plant of Renown.*[8]

Contemporary with Jeremiah and Ezekiel was the prophet Daniel. He seems to have been favoured with as large a share of the Spirit of inspiration as almost any that went before, or that came after, till John the Baptist arose. Indeed his predictions are so particular and distinct, that some have contended they were written since the events took place.

76. His account of the *stone cut out of a mountain without hands* seems to imply something supernatural, either in the *person* of our Saviour, or in the *mode* of his *advancement* to *universal empire.*[9]

77.* *I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the* SON OF MAN *came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the* ANCIENT OF DAYS *and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom,* THAT ALL PEOPLE, NATIONS, AND LANGUAGES SHOULD SERVE HIM: *his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.* Ch. 7. 13, 14. This is a prediction of Messiah's kingdom, and that all people, nations, and languages should serve

[8] Ez. 34. 23, 24, 29. We have the same ideas in the thirty seventh chapter, where Messiah is called the *Shepherd*, the *Prince*, and the *King* of his people, together with God's Servant *David*. See Lowth's Commentary on Ez. 37. 22.

[9] Dan. 2. 34, 35, 44, 45. See Bishop Chandler's Defence of Christianity, p. 122.

serve him. Does not this imply religious homage? And is this homage consistent with the character of simple humanity? Consult Lowth's Commentary on this remarkable passage.

78. *O Lord our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate,* FOR THE LORD'S SAKE. Ch. 9. 17. For the sake of the *Messiah* hear the prayer of thy servant. The Socinians will say, this is an idiom of the Hebrew language. It may be so: but when the general sense of the holy scriptures is considered, I think it will bear the sense here put upon it. It is not of any great consequence, however, in what manner it is understood. See Lowth's Commentary on the place, where he understands it in the same manner. "For the sake of the *Messiah*, known by the "title of the LORD among the Jews; see Ps. "110. 1. and called Messiah the Prince, verse "25th. of this chapter."

The information which the archangel Gabriel gave to Daniel, more especially with respect to the *atonement* Messiah should make for sin, seems strongly to imply, that he should be *more* than man: for no *mere* man could make atonement for the sins of man. The Socinians are so sensible of this, that they universally reject, not only the divinity, but also the atonement for sin, which he made by the shedding of his blood. Let the reader peruse the passage, however, and judge for himself whether it doth not contain the doctrine of atonement.

79. "Seventy precise weeks are upon thy people, and "upon thy holy city, to restrain the apostacy, "and to put an end to sins, and to expiate iniquity, and to bring in the righteousness of ages, "and to seal the vision even of the prophet, and "to anoint the holy of holies. Yet know and "understand, from the going forth of an edict

"to

" to rebuild Jerusalem until Messiah the prince,
" shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two
" weeks; it shall be rebuilt, the streets and their
" walls, in the narrow limit of the times: then
" after the threescore and two weeks shall Mes-
" siah be cut off; and though none shall be for
" him, the people of the Prince that cometh
" shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; so
" that they shall cut down as with an inundation,
" and even to the end of a decisive war shall be
" desolations. Yet one week shall make a firm
" covenant with many, and the midst of the
" week shall cause the sacrifice and the meat-of-
" fering to cease; and when upon the border
" shall be the abomination of desolation, that
" which is decided, until the full accomplishment,
" shall be poured upon the desolate. [1]

About 550 years before the Son of God was born, lived the prophet Haggai, who clearly predicted the Saviour's advent.

80. *Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and* THE DESIRE *of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts: and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts.* [2]

Zechariah was contemporary with Haggai, and he describes the person of our Saviour under more figures than one.

[1] Dan. 9. 24—27. This is Wintle's new translation, which may be compared with the common one. It is not easy to render the passage in intelligible English. See Lowth's Com. for a good explanation of this difficult passage.

[2] Hag. 2. 6—9. See Allix's Judg. p. 358.

81.* *Sing, and rejoice, O daughter of Sion: for lo,* I *come, and* I *will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the* LORD. *And many nations shall be joined to the* LORD *in that day, and shall be my people: and* I *will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the* LORD OF HOSTS *hath sent* ME *unto thee.*[3] *Jehovah* speaks and declares that the *Lord* of *hosts* had sent him. These can be no other than the *Father* and *the Son.*

82. *Thus saith the Lord of hosts—Behold, I will bring forth* MY SERVANT, THE BRANCH. Ch. 3. 7, 8. Here the Lord speaks, and declares that he will bring forth his Servant, the *Messiah*, whom he calls the *Branch*; which is sometimes translated the *East*, and in St. Luke the *Day-Spring.*

83. *Thus speaketh the* LORD OF HOSTS, *saying, Behold the* MAN *whose name is the* BRANCH, *and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and* RULE *upon his* THRONE, *and he shall be a* PRIEST *upon his* THRONE, *and the counsel of peace shall be between them* BOTH.[4] Messiah was to be both a *King* and a *Priest*, and the counsel of peace was to be between the *Father* and his *Son*, the *Messiah.*

84. *Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold,* THY KING *cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation, lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass.* Ch. 9. 9. Messiah is often spoken of in scripture as the King of Israel; see Ps. 2. 7; Jer. 23. 5; ibid. 30. 9; Hosea 3. 5; John 1. 49; and

[3] Zech. 2. 10, 11. This was always referred to Messiah by the ancient Jews. See Allix's Judgment, p. 37, and Pearson on the Creed, Art. 2. p. 149.

[4] Zec. 6. 12, 13. Both Philo and Jonathan refer this passage to the Messias. See Allix's Judg. p. 408, and Fleming's Christology, vol. 1. p. 249.

and compare Mark 11. 10; and Luke 19. 38.

85. *I will strengthen them in the* LORD, *and they shall walk up and down in* HIS *name, saith the* LORD. Ch. 1. 12. Is this an idiom of the Hebrew language, or is it expressive of two *Jehovahs*, the *Father* and the *Son?*

86.* *And I said unto them, If ye think good, give* ME *my price; and if not, forbear; so they weighed for* MY *price thirty pieces of silver. And the* LORD *said unto* ME, *Cast it unto the potter; a goodly price that* I *was prized at of them! And* I *took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.* Ch. 11. 12, 13. *Messiah* is here again evidently distinguished by the name *Jehovah*. Compare Mat. 27. 9, 10.

87. I *will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon* ME *whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for* HIM, *as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.* Ch. 12. 10. It is the *Lord* that speaks in this passage, and declares *himself* to be the *person* whom the Jews should *pierce*. Compare John 19. 37. See Lowth's Commentary on the place, who applies it in this manner, and refers to Grotius, Pearson, and Chandler, as of the same opinion.

88.* *Awake, O sword, against* MY SHEPHERD, *and against the man that is* MY FELLOW, *saith the* LORD OF HOSTS; *smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.*[5] Ch. 13. 7.

 90.* *And*

[5] This expression—*The man that is* MY FELLOW—is well explained by that of St. Paul, Phil. 2. 6, where the Apostle says—*who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be* EQUAL WITH GOD. The original word is עמיתי contribulis, vel coequalis—*my fellow*, or *my equal*. The expression occurs no where, but in this verse, and in the book of Leviticus. In one text it is explained

89.* *And the* LORD MY GOD[6] *shall come, and all the saints with thee.* Zech. 14. 5. or with him. This is explained by a multitude of passages in the New Testament, where *Christ* is represented as coming to judge the world, attended with his mighty angels. Christ therefore is the person who is here denominated, *The Lord my God.* Compare Matt. 16. 27; 25. 31; and Mark 8. 38. See Lowth on the place.

Malachi was the last of the Prophets. He lived near 400 years before Christ. One of his predictions of Messiah is very remarkable.

90.* *Behold,* I *will send* MY *Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before* ME; *and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to* HIS TEMPLE, *even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the* LORD *of hosts.* Ch. 3. 1.[7]

91. *Unto you that fear my name shall the* SUN *of* RIGHTEOUSNESS *arise with healing in his wings.*[8] Our Saviour announces himself as the *Light* of the world, John 9. 5, agreeable to this prophetic character.

by *brother*, or partaker of the same nature. In the other place, I believe, it will be found to signify, not barely a *neighbour*, but an *equal*; one who stands upon the same level, with regard to the claims of equity, and the common rights of life.—In either sense it militates strongly for the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. See Hervey's Theron and Aspasio, let. 8.

" The original Hebrew word," says Dr. Eveleigh, " will justify " any inference concerning the equality of the persons compared, " which may be drawn from the word *Fellow* in our translation.— " The expression means the same as Zech. 2. 8—11, where the " Father and the Son are equally stiled *Lord of Hosts.*"

[6] יהוה אלהי

[7] Mr. Whitaker in his Origin of Arianism, p. 218, considers Messiah as the speaker in this passage. If the conjecture is just, Messiah is the Lord of hosts.

[8] Mal. 4. 2. This was applied to Messiah by the ancient Jews. See Allix's Judgment, p. 44.

SECTION VI.

Observations on the name JEHOVAH, and the *invisibility* of the DIVINE BEING.

THESE are some of the most clear and striking prophecies, contained in the Old Testament, concerning the *person* of our blessed Saviour. There are many others, dispersed up and down that wonderful volume, which indicate various other circumstances concerning both his person, offices, and kingdom, that are not necessary to be produced in the present inquiry.[9]

It will, however, throw considerable light upon the subject, if we attend to the most remarkable *supernatural*

[9] An epitome of these prophecies I will insert into this note:—1. The time of our Saviour's coming was predicted, Gen. 49. 10.—Dan. 9. 24.—and Hag. 2. 3—9.—2. The place of his birth, Mic 5. 2.—Mat. 2. 8.——3. That he should spring from David, Is. 9. 6, 7.—Luke 1. 26, 27, 32.——4. That he should be born of a virgin, Gen. 3. 15.—Is. 7. 14.—Luke 1. 27, 35.—5. That he should have a forerunner, Is. 40. 3.—Mal. 3. 1.—Luke 3. 4.—Mat. 3. 1.——6. That he should work miracles, Is. 35. 4, 5.—Mat. 11. 5.——7. That he should come with great meekness, Is. 42. 1, 2, 3.—Mat. 12. 17—21.——8. That he should enter Jerusalem on an ass, Zec. 9. 9.—Mat. 21. 4.——9. That he should be betrayed by one of his own disciples, Ps. 41. 9.—Mat. 26. 47.——10. That he should be sold for thirty pieces of silver, Zec. 11. 12.—Mat. 26 15.——11. His sufferings are described like an history, Is. 53.—Mat. 26 and 27.——12. His burial was predicted, Ps. 88. 4, 5, 6.—Is. 53. 9.—Mat. 27. 60.——13. That he should rise again, Ps. 16. 9.—Mat. 28. 6.——14. That his resurrection should be on the third day, Hos. 6. 2.—Mat. 27. 63; and 28. 6.——15. That he should establish a new law, Jer. 31. 31.—Heb. 8. 8.——16. The he should abolish the old sacrifices and be the author of a new sacrifice, Mal. 1. 10, 11.—Luke 22. 19.—Heb. 13. 10.——17. That the Jews should be cast off, Is. 50. 1, 2.—Acts 13. 46; and 28. 25—28.——18. That the Gentiles should become the people of God, Ps. 2. 8.—Hos. 1. 9.—Rom. 10. 18.—Ibid. 9. 26.——19. That he should come with all his saints, Zech. 14. 5.—2 Thess. 1. 7, 8.——20. That he shall reign forever, Dan. 7. 13, 14.—Luke 1. 33.

tural appearances, recorded in the writings of Moses and the Prophets; for, they seem to me, to convey very strong evidence, not only for our Lord's pre-existence, but also for his supereminent dignity and glory. Some of these we will now therefore attend to. But, in order to do this with greater effect, it will be proper to make these two observations: first, that the name JEHOVAH is never applied to any merely created being: and, secondly, that *no man hath seen* GOD, the Father, *at any time.* These two assertions are both founded upon the plainest declarations of holy writ.

1. Thus, with respect to the former it is said, I AM THAT I AM. *Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel,* I AM *hath sent me unto you.* Ex. 3. 14.

2. God commanded Moses to say unto the children of Israel, *Jehovah, the God of your fathers,* &c. *hath sent me unto you: this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.* Ex. 3. 15. That this last clause relates to the name JEHOVAH, and not to his merely being the God of Abraham, &c. appears by comparing it with the former verse, and also with Hosea 12. 5. JEHOVAH, *the God of hosts,* JEHOVAH *is his memorial.*

3. *Abraham called on the name of* JEHOVAH, *the everlasting God.* Gen. 21. 33. Hence it should seem, JEHOVAH, and EVERLASTING GOD, are synonymous and convertible terms.

4. *Thou hast avouched* JEHOVAH *this day to be thy God—and* JEHOVAH *hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people.* Deut. 26. 17, 18.

5. *That thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name,* JEHOVAH THY GOD. Deut. 28. 58.

6. JEHOVAH *is thy name forever*: JEHOVAH *is thy memorial from generation to generation.* Ps. 135. 13.

7. JEHOVAH *is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King.* Jer. 10. 10.

8. *I am* JEHOVAH, *that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another.* Is. 42. 8.

9. *I am*

9. *I am* JEHOVAH, *and there is none else, there is no God besides me.* Is. 45. 5.

10. *Thou, whose name* ALONE *is* JEHOVAH, *art the most high over all the earth.* Ps. 83. 18.

11. JEHOVAH *is a man of war*: JEHOVAH *is his name.* Ex. 15. 3.

Besides these passages, where the name of JEHOVAH is appropriated to the Divine Being, there are many others, where the same term is used to assert his supreme power and authority, glorying and triumphing in it as his distinguishing character. The following may be sufficient:—

1. *I, even I am* JEHOVAH, *and besides me there is no Saviour.* Is. 43. 11.

2. *I form the light, and create darkness, I make peace and create evil: I* JEHOVAH *do all these things.* Is. 45. 7.

3. *Who hath declared this from ancient time? Have not I* JEHOVAH? *and there is no God else besides me.* Is 45. 21.

4. *Behold, I am* JEHOVAH, *the God of all flesh: Is there any thing too hard for me?* Jer. 33. 27.

5. *I am* JEHOVAH; *I change not.* Mal. 3. 6.

6. *All the gods of the nations are idols: but* JEHOVAH *made the heavens.* Ps. 96. 5.

7. *Against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: I am* JEHOVAH. Ex. 12. 12.

From these several texts of holy writ, it is evident, that the name JEHOVAH is peculiar to the Supreme Being. It is equally evident, from various other passages, that it is frequently applied to Messiah. Messiah therefore is possessed of real and proper divinity.

The latter observation I proposed to make, was, that *no man hath seen God*, the Father, *at any time.* The scripture is as positive upon this as the former. Thus St. John:—

1. *No man hath seen* GOD *at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* John 1. 18.

2. Again, our Saviour himself:—*Not that any man hath*

hath seen the FATHER, *save he who is of God, he hath seen the* FATHER. John 6. 46.

3. St. Paul calls the Father, *The King eternal, immortal,* INVISIBLE. 1 Tim. 1. 17.

4. And again, speaking of the same blessed Being, he says, *Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man* HATH SEEN, *or* CAN SEE. 1 Tim. 6. 16.

5. Again:—*The* INVISIBLE *God.* Col. 1. 15.

6. And, lastly:—*Him who is* INVISIBLE. Heb. 11. 27.

From these six declarations, I deduce an argument, that Christ is more than man. For if no *mere* man hath ever seen the Father, or *can* see him; and if Jesus Christ *hath seen* that glorious Being, which he declares he *has*; then it will follow, that Jesus Christ is more than *mere* man.

In conformity with these two observations, it was the general opinion of the Ancients, both Jews [1] and Christians, that all the appearances of God under the Old Testament dispensation, and even from the beginning of the world, were made by the *Logos*, the eternal Son of the eternal Father; nay, that the world itself was created by this august Person. A few of these manifestations of the Son of God to the world we will therefore proceed to particularize.

[1] "R. Menachem—and his authors teach constantly, that it was "the Shekinah (the Logos) which appeared to Adam after his sin, "and made him some clothes, fol. 59. col. 4. That it appeared "to Abraham, fol. 35. col. 2. That it appeared to Jacob at "night, fol. 36. col. 2. And to the same upon the ladder, fol. "41 and 42. That it appeared to Moses, Exod. 3. fol. 55. col. "2. And to the people upon mount Sina, fol. 56. col. 2. That "it spake to Moses, and gave the Law to the people, fol. 57. col. "2 and 3. fol. 58. col. 1. and fol. 84. col. 1 and 2.——They "say, that the Shekinah alone was intrusted with the care and con-"duct of Israel, fol. 28. col. 3. and fol. 153. col. 2.

Allix's Judgment, p. 165, 166.

"The Jews in the ages next to the Paraphrases assert, that God "descended nine times, and that the tenth time he shall descend in "the age to come, that is, in the time of the Messias. The first "time was in the garden of Eden. The second at the confusion of "tongues. The third at the destruction of Sodom. The fourth

SECTION VII.

Opinions of both *Ancients* and *Moderns*, on the DIVINE APPEARANCES, under the Old Testament dispensation.

92. WHEN the Almighty came forth to create the world at the beginning of time, it was not in his own proper person, but in the person of his SON, the eternal LOGOS, as his vicegerent.[2] That it was the LOGOS who created the world, seems to have been the prevailing opinion of all the Ancients. The Heathen philosophers, Tertullian tells us, sometimes spake of a person under that appellation as the Maker of the universe. Zeno, Heraclitus, and Amelius, in particular, were of that opinion.[3] The learned Philo has given us his judgment in various parts of his works to this purpose, particularly in his pieces De Mundi Opif. and De Monar. The Christian fathers every where took it for granted as a thing not to be called in question;[4] and the writings of the New Testament are as full and explicit as human language can well make them. See John 1. 1—14.——Col. 1. 16, 17.——Heb. 1. 2, 10—12. Let the reader, who wishes to enjoy an elegant intellectual feast, turn to the seventh book of Milton's Paradise Lost, and he will find the LOGOS of God coming forth from his holy rest, where he eternally had dwelt in the bosom of his

S Father,

" at his talking with Moses on mount Horeb. The fifth at his ap-
" pearance on Sinai. The sixth and seventh where he spake to
" Moses in the hollow of a rock. The eighth and ninth in the
" tabernacle. The tenth will be, when he shall appear in the times
" of the Messias."

Allix's Judg. p. 282, 283.

[2] Consult the first chapter of Genesis.—— [3] See Bishop Horne's Sermons, vol. 1. p. 194.

[4] See the fifth, sixth, and seventh parts of this Apology for evidence at large on these several heads.

Father, to create the world, described with wonderful strength and majesty of language.

93. When God appeared to our first parents in the garden of Eden, and conversed with them after their unhappy fall, it is presumed, this was not the FATHER of the universe, but the eternal LOGOS, who conducted all the divine dispensations from the beginning. [9]

That the Son of God, before he took upon him human nature, did conduct all the divine dispensations, has been, and now is, the opinion of some of the most able and learned men of every denomination. I know of none among us who reject the sentiment, except the Deists and Socinians. The Arians and Orthodox are at one on this subject. And as this opinion, if once fairly established, absolutely subverts the Socinian hypothesis, that Christ had no existence before he was born of the virgin Mary, we will dwell a little on the subject, and advance some such considerations as appear to us altogether conclusive.

1. It has been the uniform opinion of men the most competent to judge, though on other subjects they widely differed from each other.

2. It appears from the internal marks of various of those dispensations recorded in scripture.

3. From the application of many passages of the Old Testament to the Son of God in the New by the Apostles, who wrote under the direction and influence of the Holy Spirit, which passages can be applied to no merely created being whatever.

4. From the opinion of the most able and learned of the ancient Jewish writers, who usually applied the appearances of God, both before and during their own dispensation, to the Logos.

5. From

[9] What Moses calls *the voice of the Lord God*, Gen. 3. 8, Onkelos paraphrases, "They heard the voice of the WORD of the LORD. —"The WORD of the Lord called unto Adam."

5. From the uniform sense of the Christian church, even in its best and purest ages.

If we can establish these five propositions, it will be easily granted, that Christ, in his divine nature, conducted all the dispensations of God from the beginning.

1. It has been the uniform opinion of men the most competent to judge, though on other subjects they have differed most widely from each other.

This proposition, I apprehend, will be granted, though their concurrence in sentiment will be accounted for upon different principles. We will, however, produce the declarations of several of our learned men, that the reader may see at one view I am not singular in the opinion now under consideration.

1. Dr. Hammond says, that "it was the general "opinion of the ancient Fathers of the church, that "he, who appeared of old to the Patriarchs, was not "the first, but the second person in the Trinity, and "that these his appearances were preludes to his incarnation." On the New Testament, p. 820.

2. Dr. Waterland says, that "all the appearances "of God, under the Old Testament, were supposed by "the Ancients to have been in and by God the Son. "It was he that called himself God of Abram, Isaac, "and Jacob, and all along headed and conducted the "people of the Jews. This notion, so far, is just, and "the fact true." Eight Sermons, p. 157.

3. Shuckford tells us, that "the God of Israel, the "Divine Person, who is many times stiled, in the Old "Testament, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, "and the God of Jacob, frequently appeared to them, "and was in after ages made flesh, and for about three "and thirty years dwelt on earth amongst men." Connexion, vol. 3. p. 43.

4. Dr. Gregory Sharpe informs us, that "Messiah "appeared to Abraham in the plains of Mamre, to "Isaac in Gerar, to Jacob in Bethel, and was seen of "Moses in the wilderness. He is the leader of the "host

" host of Israel, the Word of God by whom he made " the world; by whom he conversed with the first and " best of human kind; whom he sent as a Saviour to " redeem his people from their servitude and oppres- " sion in Egypt, their captivity in Babylon; and, at " last, in the flesh, to redeem the world from the pol- " lution of sin, and dominion of death; the messen- " ger of God; the messenger of the covenant; the " Son of God; the angel of the Lord; one distinguish- " ed as such from all others called the sons of God, " who are ministring angels; the desire of all nations; " descended from Abraham, in whom all nations of " the earth were to be blessed; the son of David, and " in consequence of this descent, the son of man; " whose appearance or likeness, as a man, was, upon " the throne, supported by the Cherubim; and whose " likeness came with the clouds of heaven to the An- " cient of days.—

" It is, therefore, evident, that all the several appel- " lations, given to our Lord and Saviour in the New " Testament, are no other than had long before been " given by the Prophets to him, whom the Jews ex- " pected as their deliverer and their king, about the " time when Jesus was born." Second Argument in Defence of Christianity, p. 71, &c.

5. Bishop Bull assures us, that " all the catholic " Doctors of the three first centuries taught, that Jesus " Christ, he who was afterwards so called, existed, be- " fore he became man, or before he was born accord- " ing to the flesh, of the blessed Virgin, in another na- " ture, far more excellent than the human nature; that " he appeared to holy men, giving them an earnest, as " it were, of his incarnation; that he always presided " over and provided for the church, which in time to " come he would redeem by his own blood; and of " consequence that from the beginning the whole order " or thread of the divine dispensation ran through him; " farther yet, that he was with his Father before the

" foundation

" foundation of the world, and that by him all things " were made.—He is a stranger to the Fathers who " knows not this." Defensio Fid. Nic. sect. 1. cap. 1.

6. Bishop Conybeare says, " the Jews were related " to Christ in an especial manner, as the angel of the " covenant—their redeemer from captivity—the giv- " er of their law—their guide in the wilderness—the " constant governour of their state—and, at last, when " he assumed human nature, as their king, by descent " from David." Sermons, vol. 1. p. 48.

7. The late Dr. Law, bishop of Carlisle, a good judge in these matters, and one who was strongly disposed to lean to the opposite scheme, if evidence to the contrary had not been extremely satisfactory, allows all that we are here contending for. " The Angel," says he, " which God sent before the Israelites, to keep " them in the way, was probably Christ himself, who " seems to have spoken unto Moses in mount Sina, " Acts 7. 38; and whom the children of Israel are " said to have *tempted* in the wilderness, 1 Cor. 10. 9. " (Comp. Whitby) to which also some refer Heb. 11. " 26. Vid. Doddridge in loco. Nor is it less probable, " that the same divine person, who created the world, " Col. 1. 16. had also the government and administration " of it from the very beginning; appearing to our first " parents, to the Patriarchs and their posterity, (Gen. " 17. 1; 35. 9, 11, 13. 48. 15, 16.) sometimes in " the *name* and character of Jehovah, Ex. 23. 21. " (Is. 6. 1, 5. comp. John 12. 41.) or in the pre- " sence of God, ib. 33. 14. or his *Word*, according " to the Jerusalem Targum, passim. Sometimes as " an *Angel*, Is. 63. 9. Vid. Lowth. the captain of his " host, Josh. 5. 13, 14. the messenger of his cove- " nant, Mal. 3. 1. though under the name of *Michael*, " the archangel, he was more particularly distinguished " as the tutelary Prince of Israel, Deut. 32. 8, 9. ac- " cording to the Seventy, Dan. 10. 21; 12. 1. Ec- " clus. 17. 17. Rev. 12. 7."[6]

[6] Theory of Religion, p. 87.

8. Our great Epic poet hath delivered the same sentiment:—

> " Whom shall I send to judge them? Whom but thee,
> " Vicegerent Son? To thee I have transferr'd
> " All judgment, whether in heaven, or earth, or hell."
>
> Paradise Lost, book 10. l. 55.

The above instances may suffice as specimens of the opinions of learned men upon the subject in question. Much more to the same purpose might be produced. We will now, however, proceed to the next thing proposed, which was to observe,

2. That there are certain *internal* marks in the several manifestations of God, recorded in the Old Testament, whereby it appears, that those manifestations were made to mankind, not by the *Father* of the universe, in his own person, but by his eternal *Son*, the *Messenger of the covenant*.

The truth of this proposition, will be sufficiently manifest, from a careful perusal of the several histories of God's Providence now under consideration, if we observe in such perusal, that the Being, who appears and speaks, is evidently *more* than an *Angel*, and that God the Father never is called an angel, and never hath been seen by man. If, therefore, the glorious Being, who appears in those several dispensations, is neither the FATHER of the universe, nor a *mere* ANGEL; we have every reason to conclude it is the *Logos* of God.

3. From the application of many passages of the Old Testament to the Son of God in the New by the Apostles, who wrote under the direction and influence of the Holy Spirit, which passages can be applied to no merely created being whatever, it appears Christ was the conducter of all the divine dispensations from the beginning of the world.

For the proof of this important proposition, I need only refer the reader to the first chapter of the Epistle

to the Hebrews. This single chapter is decisive. The Socinians are so sensible of the force of the Apostle's application of the Old Testament to the Son of God in the chapter before us, that, not being able to preserve their hypothesis, some of them expunge the chapter as spurious. Dr. Priestley, indeed, has not told the public, I think, that he considers it as an interpolation, but then he proceeds in a way that conveys a much greater reflection upon all the Apostles, and the whole word of God recorded in the New Testament. For he tells us that "it is evident the Apostles often applied the scrip-"tures very improperly,"[7] and "he thinks he has "shewn that St. Paul often reasons inconclusively."[8] The question then comes to this, whether the Apostles in general, and St. Paul in particular, have applied the scriptures properly, and reasoned conclusively, or whether Dr. Priestley has proved them erroneous. If Dr. Priestley is right and they are wrong, Socinianism has got the day, and the New Testament is calculated only to mislead and deceive. If, on the contrary, the Apostles have applied the scriptures properly, and St. Paul has reasoned conclusively, then Jesus Christ pre-existed his conception in the womb of the blessed Virgin, conducted the divine dispensations from the beginning, according to the opinion of most moderate and candid men, and the cause of Socinianism loses the day. It is Dr. Priestley and St. Paul, and the writings of Dr. Priestley and the writings of St. Paul. If the former is right, the latter is wrong; but if St. Paul is right then Dr. Priestley is wrong. Reader, judge for thyself, and take thy side; for thou canst not concur with both, any more than thou canst serve God and mammon.

4. From the opinions of the most able and learned of the ancient Jewish writers, who usually applied the appearances of God, both before and during their own dispensation

[7] Theolog. Repos. vol. 4. p. 442.
[8] Hist. of Cor. vol. 2. p. 370.

dispensation to the *Logos*, it is manifest the same *Logos* was the conductor of the divine œconomy from the beginning.

We have already observed, that Philo, the learned Jew, whose works we now have, and who lived in the time of our Saviour, before his countrymen had conceived such prejudices against the gospel, and contrived means to alter their ancient and approved method of interpreting the writings of Moses and the Prophets; this same Philo, I say, ascribes the creation of the world to the *Logos* of God. And, in his book concerning Dreams, he expressly says, that is was the *Logos* who spake to Adam in the garden; who called Moses out of the bush, saying, Moses! Moses! and who rained fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah. He says, moreover, that the Angel, who presided over the Israelites in the wilderness, was the Word, the First-begotten of the Father, by whom he governs all things. "He often affirms there are three things in God; and "he calls the Reason, or Word of God, the Name of "God, the Maker of the world; not unbegotten, as "is God the Father of all; nor yet begotten in like "manner as men are. The same is likewise called the "Angel, or the Ambassador, who takes care of the "universe."[9]

Moses, the son of Nachman, another ancient Jewish writer, is of the same opinion with the learned Philo upon this subject. And, indeed, they do not seem to deliver these sentiments as any opinions peculiar to themselves, but rather as the common notions of their learned countrymen. The said Moses observes, that the "Angel, to speak the truth, is the Angel, the Redeem-"er, of whom it is written, *Because my Name is in him.* "That Angel, I say, who said to Jacob, *I am the God* "*of Bethel.* He of whom it is said, *And God called Moses*

[9] Grotius de Verit. lib. 5. sect. 21, where the Reader will find all the places in the works of Philo referred to. We shall produce them at large in another part of this work.

" *Moses out of the bush.* And he is called an Angel, " because he governs the world. For it is written, " Jehovah brought us out of Egypt; and in other " places, he sent his Angel, and brought us out of " Egypt. Besides, it is written, *And the Angel of his* " *presence hath made them safe*; namely, that Angel " which is the presence of God, concerning whom it " is said, *My presence shall go before, and I will cause* " *thee to rest.* Lastly, this is the Angel of whom the " Prophet said, *And suddenly the Lord whom ye seek* " *shall come into his temple, even the Angel of the cove-* " *nant whom ye desire.*"

And, again, other words of the same person to this purpose: " Consider diligently what those things " mean; *My face shall go before thee:* for Moses and " the Israelites always wished for the first Angel; but " they could not rightly understand who he was. For " they had it not from others, nor could they arrive " fully at it by prophetic knowledge. But the pre- " sence of God signifies God himself, as is confessed " by all interpreters; neither could any one understand " those things by dreams, unless he were skilled in the " mysteries of the law."

And, again: " My presence shall go before, that is, " *the Angel of the covenant* whom ye desire, in whom " my presence will be seen. Of whom it is said, *I* " *will hear thee in an acceptable time; for my Name is* " *in him, and I will make thee to rest;* or I will cause " him to be kind and merciful to thee. Nor shall he " guide thee by a rigid law, but kindly and gently." [1]

Such are the sentiments of these ancient and learned Jewish writers!

The Chaldee Paraphrases, which are nearly as ancient as any Jewish books we now have (the writings of Moses and the Prophets excepted) abound with applica-

T tions,

[1] Vide Poli Syn. in Josh. 5. 14; and Jamieson's Vindication, vol. 1. p. 70.

tions, of the appearances of the Almighty, to the *Word* of God, his eternal *Son*. In the Chaldee he is called the *Memra* of God, which answers to the *Logos*[2] of God in Greek, and the *Word* of God in English. To this Memra these Paraphrases ascribe the creation and government of the world, and particularly the government of the Jewish church and nation. Now, the question is, what is meant by this *Memra*, in the sense of the Paraphrasts? On this subject there is a controversy. Much does not, indeed, depend upon it, which way soever the meaning is determined, but yet it is of some importance. The Socinians take one side of the question, the Arians and Orthodox the other. The Socinians say, it is a mere idiom of the Chaldee language, and signifies no more than *himself*. The Arians and Orthodox, on the contrary, insist upon it, that when the Paraphrasts say, The *Memra* of God did or spoke such and such a thing, we are to understand their meaning to be, that the *Logos* or *Son* of God, our blessed Saviour, before his incarnation, did or said such and such things.[3] Now, I confess, there is much to be advanced

[2] The late Mr. Robert Robinson of Cambridge has observed, that "no word has occasioned greater controversies than this. The "truth seems to be—that Christ *appeared* to the patriarchs before "his incarnation—that the Jews called the person appearing MEMRA JEHOVÆ, the WORD of the Lord—that the Targumists used "this term to describe the Messiah—that St. John writing in "Greek, translated MEMRA into LOGOS, by which terms the hellenistic Jews understood the Messiah."

Claude's Essay, vol. 1. p. 306.

[3] Jonathan on Deut. 32. 43. speaks of the atonement as being made by this Memra; "God will atone by his WORD for his land, "and for his people, even a people saved by the WORD of the "Lord."

There are two or three places in the 26th chap. of Levit. which fully determine the Memra to be a person distinct from God the Father. In the 9th verse it is said, *I will have respect unto you.* This is rendered by Onkelos; "I will look upon you in my WORD." At the 11th verse it is, *My soul shall not abhor you.* This he renders, "My WORD shall not abhor you." At the 12th verse the

vanced on each side of this curious question; and as the point does not appear to me so clear as to carry full conviction, to an honest mind, either way, I should be sorry to rest any important point of doctrine absolutely upon so precarious a foundation. Mr. Lindsey in his Apology, p. 88, does not do *full* justice to the learned Prideaux and Capellus. He says they have set aside those *fancies* of the Orthodox, who explain the phrase Memra of God, concerning the Son of God. It appears, however, to me, that neither of these Gentlemen do absolutely reject the interpretation of the Orthodox, but only think the foundation too insecure on which to rest a cause of so much importance. They both saw the force of the arguments from the commonly received interpretation of the expression, but then they saw the objections, that may be brought against it, in so strong a light, that though they both cordially embraced the orthodox scheme, yet they durst not risque the cause upon the justness of this interpretation. In so doing they acted the part, in my judgment, of wise and moderate men. I am sorry to say Mr. Lindsey does not act the same moderate and candid part, in the inference he draws from Prideaux's words on the 89th page of his Apology. Mr. Lindsey's presumption, I apprehend, never entered the head of this learned man. He knew too well that the meaning of the term *Logos*, in the beginning of St. John's gospel, had no necessary dependance upon the word *Memra* in the Chaldee paraphrasts.[4] When will men of learning study the interest of truth, more than those of an hypothesis?

But

Lord saith, *I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people.* To this Jonathan gives this gloss; "I will be your "God, and my WORD shall be unto you God the Redeemer."

[4] The term *Word* made use of in the beginning of this gospel seems to occur upon several occasions in the Old Testament for the personal Word of God; so that there is no need to consider it as altogether taken from the Chaldee paraphrasts. David says, 2 Sam. 7. 21. For thy WORD's sake, and according to thine own heart, *hast thou done all these things.* Compare this with its parallel place,

But it does not follow from the concessions of Prideaux and Capellus, that the cause of the Orthodox is desperate in this question. Bishop Kidder and Dr. Allix are not to be answered by a mere literary squib at the bottom of a page. The Demonstration of the Messias, of the former, and the Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians, of the latter, are truly learned and valuable works. Possibly, they may have carried the matter too far on the subject of the *Memra* of God. The expression may, sometimes, be an idiom of the Chaldee language. Nay even in several of those places which they have produced in their learned works it may be such an idiom. Yet it does not follow from this concession, that it is a *mere* idiom. It may be used in several and different senses. And this, I apprehend, is the truth of the case. For it appears, most incontestably, from the works of Philo, and other Jewish writers, that they did frequently, though not always, apply the term *Logos* to the expected Messiah, and considered him as the second of the three divine Principals, and the creator and preserver of the world. It is exactly the same with the New Testament writers. They use the term *Logos* not less than 300 times; but then not always in the same sense. Sometimes, it evidently, from the context, signifies,

1 Chron. 17. 19. *O Lord, for thy* SERVANT'S *sake, and according to thine own heart, hast thou done all this greatness.* Here the WORD of God in the former place is called the SERVANT of God in the latter. And we know that the term SERVANT is commonly applied to the Messiah in scripture. So Is. 42. 1. *Behold my* SERVANT *whom I uphold.*

There is an expression of a similar kind in 1 Sam. 3. 21. *The Lord appeared again in Shiloh; for the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh, by the* WORD *of the Lord.*

So Gen. 15. 1. *After these things the* WORD *of the Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield.*

See also Ps. 18. 30; Gen. 15. 3, 4, 5; Hag. 2. 4, 5; Prov. 8; Wisdom 7. 22; Heb. 4. 12, 13; Mat. 9. 19; Luke 11. 49. Consult also Jamieson's Vindication upon all these passages, book 1. chap. 9.

nifies, *the Word*, or *Son* of God; sometimes a *word*; sometimes a *saying*; sometimes *reason*; sometimes a *thing*; and sometimes a *work*.[5]

If, therefore, Philo, and other Jewish authors, as well as the New Testament writers, who have indisputably used the term *Logos* in this sense, were prior to, or contemporary with, the authors of these Chaldee paraphrases, it is natural to suppose, that the same expression, though in a different language, should sometimes occur. This is in fact the case. For though the MEMRA of God may sometimes, or even very frequently, be a mere idiom of the language, yet it is not *always* such. Sometimes, at least, it is used in such a connection, that it cannot be understood in any other sense, but as the LOGOS, and ETERNAL SON of the most high GOD. I submit it to the consideration of the reader, if he will be at the trouble to weigh in the balance of an impartial judgment the following passages, whether they are not all, or most of them, of this description. Gen. 3. 8. *And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden.* Paraphrase: "And they heard "the voice of the WORD of the Lord God walking "in the garden."—Gen. 3. 10. *And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden.* Para: "I heard the voice of "thy WORD in the garden."—Gen. 6. 6. *And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man.* Para: "And it repented the Lord with "his WORD that he had made man on the earth; and "he spake with his WORD, that he would," &c.——Gen. 7. 16. *And the Lord shut him in.* Para: "And "the Lord by his WORD covered him over."—Gen. 8. 21. *And the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground.* Para: "And God said by his WORD, "I

[5] I could wish the reader would consult Kidder and Allix for himself on the subject of the Memra of God, and for a very late application of it to the Messiah Jamieson's Vindication against Dr. Priestley, Book 1. chap. 5.

" I will not again curse the ground."—Gen. 9. 15. *And I will remember my covenant which is between me and you.* Para: " And I will remember my covenant which " is between my WORD and you."—Gen. 9. 16. *And the bow shall be in the cloud, and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature.* Para: " Everlasting covenant " which is between the WORD of God and between " every living soul."—Gen. 9. 17. *And God said—This is the token of the covenant—between me and all flesh.* Para: " This is the sign of the covenant between my " WORD and all flesh."—Gen. 15. 1. *I am thy shield.*" Para: " My WORD is thy shield."—Gen. 15. 6. *And he believed in the Lord.* Para: " And he believed in " the WORD of the Lord."—Gen. 21. 23. *Swear unto me here by God.* Para: " Swear unto me here by " the WORD of the Lord."—1 Kings 8. 57. *The Lord our God be with us.* Para: " The WORD of the " Lord God be with us."—2 Kings 18. 5. *He trusted in the Lord God of Israel.* Para: " In the WORD of " the Lord God of Israel he trusted."—2 Kings 18. 7. *And the Lord was with him.* Para: " And the " WORD of the Lord was for his help."—2 Kings 20. 6. *I will defend this city for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake.* Para: " I will defend this city " for my WORD's sake, and for my servant David's " sake."—Is. 9. 7. *The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.* Para: " By the WORD of the Lord of hosts this shall be."—Is. 10. 20. *They shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth.* Para: " They " shall trust upon the Word of the Lord, the Holy " One of Israel, in truth."—Is. 45. 17. *Israel shall be saved by the Lord.* Para: " Israel shall be saved by " the WORD of the Lord."—Jer. 1. 19. *I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee.* Para: " My WORD " is for thy help, saith the Lord, to deliver thee."—Jer. 27. 5. *I have made the earth.* Para: " I by my " Word have made the earth."—Ps. 110. 1. *The Lord*

said

said unto my Lord. Para: "The Lord spake with his "WORD."

These several instances are taken from the Targums of Onkelos, and those which follow it in Walton's Polyglot. But if we turn to the fourth volume, and examine the Jerusalem Targum upon Gen. 18. 2, we shall find the MEMRA, or WORD of God appeared unto Abraham as an ANGEL of the Lord, along with other two, and spake and acted as the judge of the whole earth. This could be no other than the Son of God, the Angel of the covenant. [6]

If to these several considerations we add the various declarations of the learned Philo concerning the Logos of God, such as that he is "the first-begotten Son and "Word of God," and the like, of which his writings are full, as will be seen in different parts of this Apology, no doubt can remain upon the mind, but that the Memra of God, so frequently used by the Paraphrasts, *sometimes*, at least, signifies the Messiah. [7]

5. Fifthly, and lastly; that this view of the Logos of God is the only just one, in opposition to the Socinians, is still more probable from the uniform sense of the writers of the Christian church, who lived in its first and purest ages, some of whom were contemporary with the Chaldee Paraphrasts. Indeed, the opinions of these writers are so full and clear, respecting the Logos of God, and their opportunities for coming to the knowledge of the truth in these matters so ample, that they appear to me to reduce the question, now under consideration, to an absolute certainty. I will produce their testimony, and then leave the decision to the judgment of every candid man.

1. Justin

[6] See too the Jerusalem Targum on Gen. 49. 18. Consult also, Fleming's Christology on these two passages, vol. 1. p. 139—142; or turn back to the 77th page of this Apology, where these paraphrases are inserted.

[7] I could wish the reader to turn to Scott's Christian Life, vol. 5. p. 135—160, where he will find considerable evidence to this purpose.

1. Justin Martyr hath delivered his sentiments very freely upon the divine appearances. "Our Christ," says he, "conversed with Moses out of the bush, in "the appearance of fire.—And Moses received great "strength from Christ, who spake to him in the ap- "pearance of fire."

Again: —"The Jews are justly reproved, for ima- "gining that the Father of all things spake to Moses, "when indeed it was the Son of God, who is called "the Angel and the Messenger of the Father.—He "formerly appeared in the form of fire, and without a "human shape to Moses and the other Prophets: but "now—being made a man of the Virgin," [8] &c.

2. Irenæus says; "The scripture is full of the Son "of God's appearing, sometimes to talk and eat with "Abraham; at other times to instruct Noah about the "measures of the ark; at another time to seek Adam; "at another time to bring down judgment upon So- "dom; then again to direct Jacob in the way, and "again to converse with Moses out of the bush." [9]

3. Tertullian is still more explicit:—"It was the "Son, who judged men from the beginning, destroy- "ing that lofty tower, and confounding their languages; "punishing the whole world with a flood of waters; "and raining fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Go- "morrah, the Lord pouring it down from the Lord:— "for he always descended to hold converse with men, "from Adam even to the Patriarchs and Prophets, in "visions, in dreams, in mirrors, in dark sentences, always "preparing his way from the beginning: [1] —Neither "was it possible, that the God; who conversed with "men upon earth, could be any other than that Word, "which was to be made flesh."

4. Clemens Alexandrinus says, "the Pædagogus "appeared to Abraham, to Jacob, wrestled with him, "and lastly manifested himself to Moses."——

Again: "Christ gave the world the law of nature, "and

[8] Apol. 1. p. 95.——[9] Lib. 4. cap. 23.——[1] Adv. Prax. cap. 16.

" and the written law of Moses. Wherefore the LORD " deriving from one fountain, both the first and second " precepts which he gave, neither overlooked those " who were before the law, so as to leave them without " law; nor suffered those who minded not the philo- " sophy of the Barbarians to do as they pleased. He " gave to the one precepts, to the other philosophy, " and concluded them in unbelief till his coming, " when, whosoever believes not, is without excuse." [2]

5. Origen says, " MY LORD JESUS CHRIST de- " scended to the earth more than once. He came " down to Esaias, to Moses, and to every one of the " Prophets." [3]

Again:—" That OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR did some- " times become as an angel, we may be induced to " believe, if we consider the appearances and speeches " of angels, who, in some texts, have said, *I am the* " *God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac*, &c." [4]

6. Theophilus of Antioch also assures us, that it was the SON of God who appeared to Adam immediately after the fall, who, " assuming the person of the *Father* " and *Lord* of all, came into paradise under the person " of *God*, and conversed with Adam." [5]

7. The Synod of Antioch:—" The SON," say they, " is sometimes called an *Angel*, sometimes the *Lord*, " sometimes *God*. For it is impious to imagine, that " the *God* of the universe is any where called an *Angel*. " But the *Messenger* of the Father is the *Son*, who " himself is LORD and GOD: for it is written, *The* " *Angel of the great council*." [6]

8. St. Cyprian observes, " that the *Angel* who ap- " peared to the Patriarchs is *Christ* and GOD." And this he confirms by producing a number of those passages from the Old Testament where an Angel of the Lord appeared and spake in the name of God. [7]

[2] Strom. 7.——[3] Huet. Origen. lib. 2. quæst. 3.——[4] Orig. in Joan.——[5] Ad Autol. lib. 2. p. 100.——[6] Epist. Syn. ad Paul. Samos.——[7] Test. adv. Jud. lib. 2. sect. 5 and 6.

9. St. Hilary to the same purpose:—"He who is "called the ANGEL of God, the same is LORD and "GOD. For the SON of God, according to the Pro- "phet, is *the Angel of the great council.* That the dis- "tinction of persons might be entire, he is called the "*Angel* of God; for he who is GOD off GOD, the same "also is the *Angel* (or Messenger) of God: and yet, "that at the same time due honour might be paid him, "he is also called LORD and GOD."[8]

10. St. Basil:—"Who then," says he, "is it, that "is called both an *Angel* and GOD? Is it not he, whose "name we are told is called *the Angel of the great cove-* "*nant*? For though it was in after times, that he be- "came *the Angel of the great covenant*; yet even before "that, he did not disdain the title of an *Angel* (or Mes- "senger.")[9]

Again:—"It is manifest to every one, that where the "same person is stiled both an *Angel* and GOD, it must "be meant of the ONLY-BEGOTTEN, who manifests "himself to mankind in different generations, and de- "clares the will of the Father to his saints. Where- "fore he who, at his appearing to Moses, called him- "self I AM, cannot be conceived to be any other per- "son, than GOD the WORD, who was *in the beginning* "*with God.*"[1]

11. St. Athanasius also:—"Who was he to whom "Abraham fell to the earth? Were they men? One of "them was GOD, with whom he discoursed. The "other two were angels.—The scripture itself doth "most clearly teach, that one of the two angels was "the SON of *God.*" This is part of a dialogue be- tween Athanasius and Macedonius. And Macedonius himself confesses, that "he who was seen by Abraham "was the SON of God."[2]

12. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, speaking of the passage in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, where he saw God sitting upon

[8] De Trinit. lib. 4.——[9] Cont. Eunom. lib. 2.——[1] Ibid.——[2] Athan. dial. 3. de Trin.

upon the throne of his glory, saith, "The FATHER, "hath no man seen at any time; but he who then ap- "peared to the Prophet was the SON." [2]

13. Theodoret, speaking of the third chapter of Exodus, says, "The reading of this place declares who "it was that was seen by Moses. The text saith, *The "Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses, and said, I am "the God of Abraham*, &c. And again, I AM THAT "I AM. This whole context proves him that ap- "peared to be GOD; but which person might it be? "Not the FATHER, not the HOLY SPIRIT, who are "never called *Angels*: wherefore it remains, that he was "the SON of *God*, who is *the Angel of the great coun- "cil.*" [4]

This evidence is ample, in proof of the MATTER OF FACT, that the great body of the Ancients, as well Jews, as Heathens, and Christians, considered the Logos of God, the Angel of the covenant, as the Conductor of all the dispensations of Divine Providence in the government of the world. [5]

SECTION VIII.

A short view of the DIVINE APPEARANCES recorded in the Old Testament.

WE have said under the second proposition, that there are certain *internal* marks in the several manifestations of God, recorded in the Old Testament, whereby it appears, those manifestation were made to mankind, not by the FATHER of the universe, in his own person, but by the LOGOS, his eternal Son, the Messenger, in aftertimes, of the new covenant. We

[2] Cat. 14.——[4] In Exod. 3. 2.——[5] See the sentiments of the Fathers more at large in the 7th part of this work.

will now return to the consideration of that proposition, and take a concise view of those appearances, and see if there be not certain traits in each, whereby it is made manifest in fact, that the Son of God pre-existed his incarnation of the Virgin.

94. The confusion of tongues, in the building of the tower of Babel, was effected by the Logos of God, in the opinion of the Ancients, both Jews and Christians; and it is presumed from certain internal marks in the narrative, that this opinion was just. See Gen. 11. 1—9, where the person who appeared is constantly denominated JEHOVAH. Bishop Patrick judges, in conformity with this, that where God says, *Let* US *go down*, he spake to his SON.

95. *After these things the* WORD OF THE LORD *came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward. And Abram said,* LORD GOD, *what wilt thou give me, &c? Behold, the* WORD OF THE LORD *came unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir, &c. And he* (the WORD of the Lord) *brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the* LORD, &c. *And he said unto him, I am the* LORD, *that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it. And he said,* LORD GOD, *whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?—In the same day the* LORD *made a covenant with Abram.* Gen. 15. 1—18. The Word of the Lord in this place, who is addressed under such magnificent titles, is supposed by very good judges, to be the Logos of God, the Conductor of all the Divine dispensations, and the Mediator between God and man, before he became incarnate for our salvation. He

that

that created the world at first by his power, the same governed it by his wisdom, redeemed it by his blood, and will judge it in the end by the strictest rules of mercy and equity. [6]

96*. The ANGEL of the Lord that appeared unto Hagar in the wilderness, seems to have been more than a common Angel, and is generally supposed by the Ancients to have been no other than the *Son* of God, the eternal LOGOS of the Father. See Gen. 16. 9—13, where there appear some internal marks of this superiority. The Chaldee paraphrase translates the 13th verse, "And she "called on the name of the Lord, who spake "with her." And the Jerusalem Targum saith, "She prayed in the name of the WORD of the "Lord, that was revealed to her, and said, Blessed art thou, O God, &c."

"This passage cannot suit with the person of "the Father, whom it would not be proper to "call an *Angel*; nor with the person of an *Angel*, "which it would not be proper to call God; but "it may comport with the person of *Christ* to "be God, as the *Son* of God, and to be an "*Angel* too, as sent to reveal his Father's will. "The heretics ought to consider that they run "counter to sacred writ, while they admit that "Christ is an *Angel*, and yet refuse to acknowledge that he is GOD also." Novat. c. 26.

Again:

[6] In the 1 Kings 18. 24, this same *Memra*, or Logos of God, is spoken of as one *sent*. *I will call on the name of the Lord*, is paraphrased by Jonathan; "I will pray in the name of the Lord, and "he shall *send* his WORD."

Deut. 4. 7, is paraphrased; "God is near in the NAME of the "Lord."

Hosea 4. 9, is paraphrased; "God will receive the prayer of "Israel by his WORD, and have mercy upon them, and will make "them by his WORD like a beautiful figtree."

Jer. 29. 14, is rendered; "I will be sought by you in my "WORD, and I will be enquired of through you by my WORD." See Jamieson's Vind. vol. 1. p. 54, 55.

Again:—"This *Angel*, if he were *only* an "*Angel*, why does he take upon him to say—"*I will make of him a great nation?*—whereas "such power belongs to GOD, and cannot be-"long to an *Angel*." Ibid.

Let the reader consult the context and judge, whether the transactions therein described can be attributed either to the FATHER of the universe, or any *merely created* ANGEL.

97.* The Being, who appeared to Abraham, and with whom he interceded for Sodom, is addressed all the way through the history of that melancholy event by the appellation of JEHOVAH:—*And* JEHOVAH *appeared unto Abraham in the plains of Mamre. And* JEHOVAH *said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do? seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of* JEHOVAH, *to do justice and judgment; that* JEHOVAH *may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him. And* JEHOVAH *said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous; I will go down now and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know. And the men turned their faces from thence, and went towards Sodom: but Abraham stood yet before* JEHOVAH. *And Abraham drew near and said, Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? Peradventure there be fifty righteous within the city: wilt thou also destroy, and not spare the place for the fifty righteous that are therein? That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked, and that the righteous should be as the wicked: that be far from thee: Shall not*

the

the JUDGE OF ALL THE EARTH *do right? And* JEHOVAH *said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes. And Abraham answered and said, Behold, now I have taken upon me to speak unto* JEHOVAH, *who am but dust and ashes: peradventure there shall lack five of the fifty righteous: wilt thou destroy all the city for lack of five? And he said, If I find there forty and five I will not destroy it. And he spake unto him yet again, and said, Peradventure there shall be found forty there? And he said, I will not do it for forty's sake. And he said unto him, Oh, let not* JEHOVAH *be angry and I will speak: Peradventure there shall be thirty found there? And he said, I will not do it, if I find thirty there. And he said, Behold, now I have taken upon me to speak unto* JEHOVAH: *Peradventure there shall be twenty found there? And he said, I will not destroy it for twenty's sake. And he said, Oh, let not* JEHOVAH *be angry, and I will speak yet but this once: Peradventure ten shall be found there? And he said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake. And* JEHOVAH *went his way, as soon as he had left communing with Abraham: and Abraham returned unto his place.*

Now what shall we say to this pathetic narration? Our Saviour assures us, that God the Father never has appeared to any man, at any time. JEHOVAH is a name never given to the *Angels*, but is always confined to the great I AM. The *Logos* of God, therefore, is the JEHOVAH here spoken of, as conversing with Abraham.

That this was the opinion of the ancient Jews is evident from the Jerusalem Targum upon this chapter, where one of the three angels is called the *Memra* of God. Thus speaks that Paraphrast upon Gen. 18. 2. "Three angels were "sent unto our father Abraham, and these three

"were

" were sent for three purposes, since it is impos-
" sible for one of the highest angels to be sent
" but for one thing. The first angel was sent to
" tell our father Abraham, that behold Sarah
" should bring forth Isaac; the second was sent
" to deliver Lot out of the midst of the over-
" throw: the third angel was sent to destroy
" Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim.
" Therefore he was the prophetic WORD, and
" the WORD of the Lord appeared to him in the
" valley of vision."

The learned Philo was of the same opinion; for he says in his book of Dreams, after reciting those words of Genesis, *The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar, and the Lord rained brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah*, he immediately adds, " For the WORD
" of God, when he visits the earth, assists those
" that are virtuous, or inclined to be so, in af-
" fording them all refuge and safety; but to them
" who oppose him he sends inevitable ruin and
" destruction."

Justin Martyr is of the same opinion:——
" When the scripture says, *The* LORD *rained fire*
" *from the* LORD *out of heaven*, the prophetic
" word indicates two numerical existences, the one
" existing on earth, whom it reports to have
" come down in order to examine the cry of
" Sodom, the other abiding in the heavens, who
" is also the LORD of the LORD *on earth*, as be-
" ing FATHER and GOD, and the cause of ex-
" istence to him, who is both powerful, and
" LORD, and GOD." Dial. cum Tryph. p. 358.

98. The story of Abimelech and Abraham, and God's appearing to vindicate Sarah's honour, is of a nature similar to all the other Divine manifestations. See Gen. 20. 3—7, where the Chaldee

dee paraphrase has it, "The WORD came from "before God."

99. The appearance of God to Abraham again concerning Ishmael is of the same kind. The circumstances of the story render it inconsistent either with the FATHER of the universe, or a created ANGEL. It must have been, therefore, the Looos of God, who appeared, according to the opinion of all antiquity. See Gen. 21. 12—21.

100.* The circumstances of the history make it very evident also, that it was the same glorious Being who appeared to Abraham again, after he had offered his only son Isaac in sacrifice.[7] The chapter begins with informing us, that GOD *did tempt Abraham.* At the twelfth verse the Angel of God says, *Lay not thy hand upon the lad, for now I know thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son from* ME. If the ANGEL of God, the ANGEL of the covenant, had not been the person, who tempted Abraham to offer up his son, he would certainly have used the pronoun *him* instead of *me*, as the term GOD immediately precedes. This will be confirmed by what follows, where the Angel swears by himself, and blesses Abraham for obeying HIS *voice*, the voice of the ANGEL, and not the voice of GOD, which it ought to have been, had the person who spoke

 been

[7] Gen. 22. In our account of all these Divine manifestations, the reader would do well to have his bible in his hand, and turn to the chapters as they occur, since it would swell this treatise (already too large) to a much greater bulk, were we to produce all the histories at length. Upon such perusal he will find, that the Person, who appears and speaks, is neither the FATHER of the universe, nor any created ANGEL. There are certain traits, however, in every one of these sacred stories, which indicate the character of the person to be truly divine.

been an inferior messenger acting in the name of Jehovah.[8]

101. When Jacob fled from his brother Esau, he was favoured with a very singular and comfortable vision of the Almighty, who declared himself to be the GOD of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac. See Gen. 28. 10—17, and compare it with Gen. 31. 11, 13, and Gen. 48. 15, 16. Upon this comparison it appears, that the GOD of Abraham and Isaac, in the first passage, is an ANGEL, in the other places. But the FATHER of the universe is never called an ANGEL: the whole must be attributed, therefore, to the SON of God, who was, at the same time, the GOD of Abraham and Isaac, the GOD of Bethel, the GOD that fed Jacob all his life long, the ANGEL, which redeemed him from all evil, and the MESSENGER of the covenant. Compare John 1. 51, and see Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 504, 505.

102.* The story of Jacob's wrestling with an angel is of a similar kind.[9] This will appear pretty manifest, if the narrative be compared with the account the prophet Hosea gives of the same transaction: *Jacob took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God: yea, he had power over the* ANGEL, *and prevailed. He wept and* MADE SUPPLICATION *unto* HIM. *He found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us; even the* LORD GOD *of hosts, the* LORD *is his memorial.*[1]

103.* Is not the appearance of the Angel to Moses in the

[8] See the faith of the ancient Jews, concerning that person who is called the Angel of the Lord, in Jamieson's Vindication, book 1. chap. 8. where the several appearances are set in a very satisfactory point of view.

[9] Gen. 32. 24—30.

[1] Hos. 12. 3—5.—"The Lord shewed, that it was not only a "*man* who then wrestled with Jacob, but also *God*." Novat. c. 27.

the bush of the same kind also? I think it is. The serious person will read the passage and judge: *And the Angel of the Lord appeared unto Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and behold the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned. And when the* LORD *saw that he turned aside to see,* GOD *called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I. And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. Moreover, he said, I am the* GOD *of thy father, the* GOD *of Abraham, the* GOD *of Isaac, and the* GOD *of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon* GOD. Ex. 3. 2—7.

Let this account be compared with the history of the same transaction in the Acts of the Apostles: *And when forty years were expired, there appeared to Moses, in the wilderness of mount Sina, an* ANGEL *of the Lord in a flame of fire in a bush. And when Moses saw it he wondered at the sight: and as he drew near to behold it, the voice of the* LORD *came unto him, saying, I am the* GOD *of thy fathers, the* GOD *of Abraham, and the* GOD *of Isaac, and the* GOD *of Jacob. Then Moses trembled and durst not behold. Then said the* LORD *to him, Put off thy shoes from thy feet; for the place where thou standest is holy ground. I have seen, I have seen, the affliction of my people, which is in Egypt, and I have heard their groaning, and am come down to deliver them.*[2] Comp. Jos. 5. 13—15.

104.* It

" He was both an ANGEL, and GOD, and LORD, who, in the " form of a man, wrestled with Jacob."

Just. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 281.

[2] Acts 7. 30—34. Justin Martyr, speaking of this transaction,

104.* It seems to have been no other than the SON of God who slew all the first-born of the land of Egypt: for the sacred history attributes the whole to JEHOVAH. The Chaldee paraphrase applies the destruction to the WORD *of the Lord*, a term common in that work for the SON of God: and the WISDOM OF SOLOMON, another Jewish composition, tells us it was "*the* ALMIGHTY WORD OF GOD," who leaped out of his throne, and executed the mighty destruction: —"While all things were in quiet silence, and "that night was in the midst of her swift course; "thine ALMIGHTY WORD leaped down from "heaven out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man "of war, into the midst of a land of destruc-"tion; and brought thine unfeigned command-"ment, as a sharp sword; and, standing up, "filled all things with death: and it touched the "heavens, but it stood upon the earth." Wisdom 18. 14—16.

105. It seems also to have been the SON of God, who gave the Law on mount Sinai, surrounded by his host of angels. Ex. 19. 3—6.

Irenæus says, that "the LORD himself (that "is Christ) spake the words of the decalogue." See lib. 4. c. 31.

Clemens Alexand. says also, that "the WORD "declared himself the pædagogue, when he said "in person, *I am the Lord thy God, who brought "thee out of the Land of Egypt*. Pædag. lib. 1. p. 131. And

says, "Permit me to shew you out of the book of Exodus, how the "very same person, who appeared to Abraham and Jacob, as an "ANGEL, and GOD, and LORD, and MAN, appeared to Moses in "a flame of fire out of the bush, and talked with him."—Soon after he adds—"You have seen, gentlemen, that the same person whom "Moses calls an ANGEL, and who conversed with him in a flame "of fire; that very person being GOD, signifies to Moses, that him-"self is the GOD of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob."

Dial. cum Tryph. p. 281, 282.

And our learned Lightfoot tells us that "*the* "*great* ANGEL CHRIST, at the giving of the "law, was the speaker, and all the created an- "gels his silent attendants." Works, vol. 2. p. 1229.

106.* Was not the ANGEL that accompanied the Israelites in the wilderness, by day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire, the SON of God also? It should seem so. The reader will form his own judgment when he has carefully perused the history of that wonderful appointment.[s]

107. The glorious Being, who revealed himself to Moses and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and the seventy Elders of Israel, appears to have been the same. Ex. 24. 9—11.

108. It appears from the circumstances of the history, that the ANGEL, who withstood Balaam in the way, as he went to curse the Israelites at the instigation of Balak, was no other than the SON of God, and the LORD of angels, the eternal WORD, by

[s] See Ex. 23. 20—22.—Ibid. 32. 34.—Ibid. 33. 2.—Isaiah 63. 9, 10.—1 Cor. 10. 9.—The learned Philo says, that God hath set over the works of his hands his *true* WORD, his *first-begotten* SON. And then he quotes that passage in the 23d. of Exodus, *Behold* I am, *and I will send my* ANGEL *before thy face to keep thee in the way.*

Philo de Agricultura, p. 195.

Clemens Alexandrinus also says, "It was the SON of God who led "the people in the wilderness."

Pædagogus, B. 1. c. 7.

Our very learned Bishop Patrick hesitates in ascribing this and some other appearances of angels to the LOGOS of God, although he admits of such appearance when any epithet discriptive of his character is added. He is affraid of degrading the Son of God, by attributing to him an office beneath his proper dignity. But when we consider how extremely low he afterwards condescended to redeem the human race, we shall not find it difficult to suppose he might be the leader of the hosts of Israel through the wilderness, and submit to other offices, which we might think beneath him, for the good of his people. See Patrick on Gen. 48. 16, and Exod. 23. 20.

by whom the worlds were made.* Num. 22. 22—35.

109.* Is not the appearance of the ANGEL to Joshua of a similar kind? It should seem from his manner of addressing him, that he was the same being who some years before had spoken to Moses in the burning bush. See Jos. 5. 13—15, and compare the two appearances. Archbishop Usher says upon this place, "Jesus our Lord, "the Prince of his Father's host, appearing to "him who was a type of him at Jericho, with "a drawn sword, promised to be the defender of "the people." Consult Patrick on the place, who is particularly satisfactory.

110.* The ANGEL of the Lord, that came up from Gilgal to Bochim, where he rebuked the children of Israel, was the same who brought them up out of Egypt, and established them in Canaan, for I, says he, *made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I sware unto your fathers, and* I *said*, I *will never break* MY *covenant with you—but ye have not obeyed* MY *voice*. See Judg. 2. 1—23. Consult Patrick on the place, where he ascribes all that is here said to the same ANGEL, who had appeared to Joshua by Jericho, and calls him *the* ANGEL *of the covenant*.

111.* The ANGEL that appeared to Gideon, likewise, seems to have been no other than the SON of God in human guise. See Judg. 6. 11—27. In the twelfth verse the Targum translates it, "The WORD of the Lord is thy help:" whereby it appears, the ancient Jews did not look upon this ANGEL merely as an heavenly messenger sent from God, but as the LORD *himself*, as he is called

* "The angel who appeared to Balaam was αυλος ὁ λογος, says Irenæus, in Fragm. p. 471. Jortin's Dissertations, p. 186.

called, ver. 14, 16, 23, 24, 25, 27. In the thirteenth verse the Targum makes it, "Is the "SCHECHINAH of the Lord our help? Whence "then hath all this happened unto us?" From which it appears the WORD *of the Lord, and the* SCHECHINAH *of the Lord*, were with them the same. Consult Patrick on the whole chapter, especially the 23d. verse, where he attributes the appearance to the SON *of God.*

112.* The ANGEL, that appeared to Manoah and his wife, seems to have been the same, who appeared to Gideon, and Joshua, and the other ancient Worthies before mentioned. Jud. 13. 2—23. I must refer the reader to Bishop Patrick again, who considers this Angel also to be the LOGOS *of God.*[5]

113. The same person, that is so frequently denominated the WORD of the Lord, is, at other times characterized by the title, *the* NAME *of Jehovah*, שם יהוה as in Isaiah 30. 27; *Behold, the* NAME *of Jehovah cometh from far, burning with his anger.* In Prov. 18. 10, we have a similar expression; *The* NAME *of the Lord is a strong tower: thither*

[5] A learned man hath summed up these divine manifestations in the manner following:—"It was the voice of the Logos Adam and "Eve heard walking in the garden.—It was he who swept away the "old world by a flood, and preserved Noah and his family. It was "he who cursed Ham and his son Canaan, by the mouth of Noah.— "It was he who called Abraham.—And in a word, it was God the "Father mediately, and the Son immediately that did and acted all "that is attributed to God in the Old, as well as in the New Testa- "ment.—Hence we may easily see whence it is said, that Moses "chose to suffer affliction, rather than to sin, as esteeming the re- "proach of Christ better than all the treasures of Egypt: and upon "what account we are exhorted not to tempt Christ, as the Israelites "in the wilderness did: and whence it is that Peter asserts, that "Christ, by his Spirit, did irradiate the Prophets of old, with all "those predictions we find in their writings, of Christ's sufferings, "and the New Testament times."

Fleming's Christology, vol. 1. p. 227—234.

thither the righteous runneth, and is safe. This is applied to Messiah in Midrasch Tillim. And Philo tells us, that the Logos is the NAME of the Lord. So that it is not improbable, but the NAME *of the Lord*, in the Prophet, is the same person. Comp. Ps. 23. 3.

114. Daniel has given us a most extraordinary manifestation both of the FATHER and the SON. Few descriptions are so sublime and magnificent. The *first person* in the *sacred* TRINITY is described in the following manner:—*I beheld till the thrones were fixed, and the* ANCIENT OF DAYS *did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels like burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.* After this, the *second person* of the TRINITY is introduced:—*And, behold, one like the* SON OF MAN *came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the* ANCIENT OF DAYS: *and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom; that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.* Dan. 7. 13, 14. When this visionary representation is compared with the other celestial appearances we have had occasion to review, it will be found, I apprehend, to confirm this general proposition, that the Son of God, who is here called the Son of man, pre-existed his human conception.

115. The prophet Zechariah had a vision of a MAN riding upon a red horse, who is called in the following verses an ANGEL; which is generally supposed to be the ANGEL of the covenant. Ch.

1.

1. 7—11. See Lowth on these verses, where he considers *one* of the *Angels* mentioned as the LOGOS *of God*, with a good degree of plausibility.

116. *And he shewed me Joshua the high-priest standing before the* ANGEL *of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the* LORD *said unto Satan, The* LORD *rebuke thee, O Satan, even the* LORD *that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee.* Zech. 3. 1, 2. Here seem to be two JEHOVAHS mentioned, one of whom is called an ANGEL, which can be no other than the ANGEL of the covenant. Comp. Ch. 12. 8. See Lowth on the place.

117. Isaiah was favoured with a vision of the Almighty truly sublime and magnificent. *In the year that king Uzziah died*, says he, *I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.* Ch. 6. 1—3. In the fifth verse of this chapter the same person is called *the King, the* LORD OF HOSTS. St. John, ch. 12. 41, tells us, that the person, whom the Prophet saw in this vision, was Jesus Christ. *These things said Isaiah when he saw his* (Christ's) *glory, and spake of him.* Christ, therefore, in the opinion of St. John, is the LORD OF HOSTS.

Eusebius understands this whole representation of the Prophet as applicable to the Son of God only. "What Lord was this," says he, "which "the Prophet saw? No other surely but he that "was seen by Abraham and the old Patriarchs, "and with whom they spake and conversed; "even he who was at once GOD, and LORD, and "ANGEL, and supreme GENERAL of God's ar-"mies. He being about to give the Prophet an "account of his appearing among men, thought "fit to represent unto him first the glory of his "kingdom, and therefore discovers himself as "sitting in state and majesty upon a most glo-

" rious throne; which throne is the same that " the Psalmist speaks of, when he says, *Thy* " *throne*, O GOD, *is forever and ever*, &c. where " it is plain that God speaks to Christ his Son " concerning his kingdom. And of this the " Psalmist speaks again, when he says, *The* LORD " *said unto* MY LORD, *sit thou*,[6] &c." Dem. Evang. l. 7. c. 1.

If all the Divine dispensations from the beginning of time have been conducted by the LOGOS of God, as the SON, and HEIR, and ANGEL of his almighty FATHER, then we may, with propriety, apply to him the most sublime hymn of the prophet Habakkuk. This is the more allowable, because the thirteenth verse expressly ascribes the mighty works commemorated in the hymn to the agency of Messiah. *Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, for salvation with thy* MESSIAH. He is speaking of the successes of Joshua, and probably alludes to the CAPTAIN of the Lord's host mentioned in Jos. 5. 13—15. It may be allowable, therefore, to consider MESSIAH as the conductor of all the wonderful works described with so much sublimity in this noble composition.

The subject of it is this: God having threatened that he would send his people into captivity for their sins, the Prophet undertakes to interceed with him, that the time of it may be shortened. This is the introduction, and is comprehended in the second verse. Then from that to the sixteenth verse he takes a survey of the many wonderful works which God had wrought for Israel in bringing them out of Egypt, and giving them possession of

[6] This application of the Prophet's vision to Christ is confirmed by the concurring testimony of most of the Christian fathers. See Just. Mart. Quest. et Resp. p. 417.—Irenæus, lib. 4. c. 37.—Athan. p. 877, 889.—Hil. Trin. l. 5. c. 33.—Basil Cont. Eunom. l. 5.—Hieron. in loco.—Epip. Ancorat. p. 13, 15.—Cyril Hier. Cat. 14.—Amb. de Fid. l. 1. c. 12.—Greg. Nyss. cont. Eunom. l. 2,

of the land of Canaan. In the sixteenth verse the Prophet describes in what manner he was affected with the threatening, and takes occasion from thence to pray, that he might be gathered to his fathers in peace, before the king of Babylon should invade Judea, and carry the people captive; adding in the seventeenth verse, as a reason for his prayer, a description of the desolation which should then come upon the land.

After this, the Prophet concludes in the eighteenth verse with declaring, that whatever became of himself, he would still rejoice in hope, that God would visit his people again with his salvation. And then, verse nineteenth, glorying in Jehovah as their strength, the Prophet rests assured, that he would in due time restore the captive Jews to their own land, giving them the agility of the hind to return once more to the fertile and darling hills of Judea.

We will now transcribe the whole hymn from Green's translation, only making two or three alterations, which seem more agreeable to the original.

118. "A Prayer of the Prophet Habakuk.

"O LORD, I have heard thy threatening:
"I am in pain, O LORD, for thy work;
"In the midst of the years revive it:
"In the midst of the years shew compassion;
"In wrath remember mercy.

"God went forth from Teman,
"Even the Holy One from mount Paran.
"His majesty covered the heavens,
"And his glory filled the earth.

"His brightness was as the brightness of the sun;
"He had beams of light issuing from his hand,
"And there was the hiding place of his power.

"The pestilence marched before him,
"And devouring fire followed after him.

" He stood and measured out the land,
" He beheld and scattered the nations.
" The eternal mountains dispersed,
" The everlasting hills bowed,
" The everlasting ways owned their Lord.

" I saw the tents of Cusham in consternation;
" And the tent curtains of the land of Midian trembled.

" Was the Lord displeased at the rivers?
" Was thine indignation against the rivers?
" Was thy wrath against the sea,
" When thou rodest on thine horses
" And thy chariots of salvation?

" No; thou laidest bare thy bow *to fight for Israel*,
" According to thy oath unto the tribes, and thy promise.
" Thou cleavedest the dry land into rivers;
" The mountains saw thee, and were in pangs.

" The overflowing water hasted away;
" The deep uttered its voice,
" And lifted up its hands on high.

" The sun and moon stood still in their habitation:
" By their light, thine arrows flew abroad;
" And by their shining, thy glittering spear.

" Thou marchedst through the land in indignation,
" Thou trampledest underfoot the nations in anger.

" Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people,
" For salvation with thy MESSIAH.*
" Thou woundedst the head of the house of the wicked;
" Thou raisedst the foundation of it, even to the rock;
" Thou piercedst through with thy sceptre the head of the village.

" When they came out as a whirlwind to scatter us,
" Their rejoicing was, as when about
" To devour the poor man in secret.

" Thou marchedst with thine horses to the western sea,
" To the heap of mighty waters.

" When

*See Whitby on 1 Cor. 10. 9.

" When I heard *thy threatening*, my bowels were troubled;
" My lips quivered at thy voice;
" A wasting entered into my bones,
" And my steps tottered under me.

" Oh, that I might be at rest before the day of distress,
" When the invader shall come up against the people with his troops!

" For then the figtree shall not flourish,
" Nor shall fruit be on the vines;
" The produce of the olive shall fail,
" And the fields shall yield no food;
" The flock shall be cut off from the fold,
" And no herd shall be left in the stalls.

" Nevertheless, I will rejoice in the LORD;
" I will be exceeding joyful in the God of my salvation.

" The Lord JEHOVAH is my strength;
" He will make my feet like hinds feet,
" And cause me to tread again on my own fertile hills!"

The words of Eusebius will close this account of the divine manifestations with effect:—" I will here ex-
" plain myself," says this learned Father, " upon the
" fundamental point of Christ's divinity and humanity,
" so as to silence those adversaries, who call the Chris-
" tian religion a new and upstart institution. They are
" therefore, desired to understand, that its author's na-
" ture and substance is of an existence ineffably eter-
" nal; for *who shall declare his generation? No one has
" known the Father but the Son, and no one the Son but
" the Father*; with whom, and from whom he subsisted
" from everlasting, the glorious minister of his will;
" by whom, as he created, so he governs all things,
" his only-begotten Son, truly God: for *in the begin-
" ning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and
" the Word was God.* All things *were made by him,
" and without him was nothing made.* Accordingly,
" Moses assures us, that the Father communicated with
" him

" him his counsel of creating man, where he says, *Let* " us *make man after our image.* To the same effect the " Psalmist; *He spake and they were made; he command-* " *ed and they were created.* The Father pronounced " his pleasure, which the Son administered. This is he " whom the Patriarchs and Prophets, both before and " after Moses, beheld frequently exhibited before their " eyes, and as frequently received with adorations. This " is the Lord God, that appeared to Abraham in a hu- " man shape, before whom he kneeled, and to whom " he addressed himself in these words, *Shall not the* " *Lord of the whole earth judge righteously?* The scrip- " ture cannot lie, nor the God-head become a human " body; so that unless by the *Lord of the whole earth,* " in this place, is meant the first unbegotten cause of " things, which it cannot be, it must signify the LOGOS, " or WORD; concerning whom the Psalmist, *He sent* " *out his* WORD *and healed them, and they were saved* " *from their destruction.* This is that LORD *that rained* " *fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah from the* LORD *out of* " *heaven*; that GOD who wrestled with Jacob, and " from whom he called the place where they strove, " *The vision of God,* because he had seen him face to " face. Nor were these the appearances of angels; " the scripture ascribing them not, as at other times, " to angels, but to God. Thus, again, when he pre- " sented himself in the form of a man before Joshua, " he tells him the place is sanctified by his presence; " at which Joshua falls upon his knees, and acknow- " ledges him CAPTAIN *of the host of the Lord.* So we " find the place where he talked with Moses consecrat- " ed by his presence; for he was the God of Abraham, " Isaac, and Jacob, the WISDOM of God *before the* " *foundation of the world, that pitched his tabernacle with* " *prudence and called to him knowledge and understanding;* " *by whom princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of* " *the earth; whom the Lord created the beginning of his* " *ways, before his works of old.* Thus it pleased the di-

" vine

" vine goodness to manifest itself—till the world being " prepared for the entertainment of his divine truths, " the SON of God came incarnate to perform, to teach, " and to suffer whatever the Prophets had foretold " concerning him; and, lastly, to receive that kingdom, " that universal everlasting dominion, which the pro- " phet Daniel represents him invested with, in the " midst of thousand thousands and ten thousand times " ten thousands. All these characteristics are applica- " ble only to the eternal WORD incarnate." [7]

We have brought our inquiry, concerning the Person of Jesus, down through the historical and prophetical scriptures, for a period of 3600 years; or rather, from the beginning of the world to the birth of Christ, which is about 4000 years; and the amount of the evidence seems to me very considerable for the pre-existence and eternal divinity of the Son of God. The reader will pay it that attention which he judges it deserves.

[7] Ecclesiast. Hist. l. 1. c. 2.

END OF THE FIRST PART.

PART SECOND.

SECTION I.

Various testimonies to the PERSON and CHARACTER of Christ, immediately antecedent to his birth, and during his abode upon earth.

IT is time to proceed to an examination of the New Testament. And here, likewise, we will conduct our inquiry, as near as may be, according to the order of time, because the evidence grows clearer and fuller, till we arrive towards the close of the scriptural canon.

119.* First, then, the angel Gabriel spake strong things of the Redeemer's glory, sometime before he was conceived in the womb:—*Many of the children of Israel*, says he to Zacharias, *shall John turn to the* LORD THEIR GOD. *And he shall go before* HIM *in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children; and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready a people prepared for the* LORD.[8]

120.* *Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb,*[9]

 and

[8] Luke 1. 16, 17.—Dr. Clarke observes upon the above words, *the Lord their God*, that "they are, in strictness of construction, immediately connected with the following word, *him*; which must necessarily by understood of Christ." Whether the expression, *the Lord their God*, will, in consequence, belong likewise to him, the reader must judge. It seems so to me; and the learned Doctor appears to have been of the same opinion.

Scrip. Doct. p. 72.

[9] "Vain are the Ebionites, who" says Irenæus, "do not receive into their faithless minds the union of GOD and MAN, but, persisting in the old leaven of production, are unwilling to understand, that the Holy Ghost came upon Mary, and the power of the High-

and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the Angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the Angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore

" est overshadowed her; wherefore that which was conceived is " holy, and the SON of the most high God, the Father of the uni- " verse, who effected his incarnation, and shewed an example of a " new generation; that, inasmuch as by the former generation, we " inherited death, so by this generation we might inherit life." Lib. 5. cap. 1.

Tertullian expresses this miraculous transaction in various ways: —" He is a ray of God, which, darting down upon a certain virgin, " and being in her womb fashioned into flesh, *was born a* MAN *mixt* " *with God.*" Apol. adv. Gentes, cap. 21.

Again:—" We have learned that Christ proceeded forth from " God, and was begotten by procedure, and, therefore, that he is " called the SON of God, and GOD, from the unity of substance." Ibid.

Again:—" The sun will be in the ray, because the ray is off the " sun, nor is the substance separated, but extended: what goeth " forth from GOD is GOD, and the SON of God, and *both* are one." Ibid.

Again:—" The flesh is not God, but he who was born in the flesh " is GOD.—A double state then we see, not confused, but united in " one person, GOD and the MAN JESUS." Adv. Prax. cap. 27.

Origen says, " The WORD of God, clothed in the flesh of Mary, " came forth into the world, and, indeed, it was one thing which in " him was seen, another which was understood. For the appear- " ance of flesh in him was obvious to all; but to few and chosen " persons was the knowledge of his GODHEAD imparted." Hom. 1. in Levit.

Again:—" Christ is the WORD of God; but *the* WORD *was* " *made flesh.* In Christ, therefore, there is one substance from " above, another assumed of the human nature and the virgin's " womb." Hom. 9. in Genesin.

St. Cyprian declares of him, that " the Holy Ghost co-operating, " he took flesh of a virgin, and thus became GOD *mixed with* " MAN." De Vanitate Idol.

fore also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called THE SON OF GOD. Luke 1. 30—35.

121.* The testimony of Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist, is this:—*And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost; and she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of* MY LORD *should come to me?* Luke 1. 41—43.

122.* The declarations of Zacharias, the father of John, are somewhat similar to those of his wife. Being filled with the Holy Ghost he said;—*And thou, child, shalt be called, the prophet of the* HIGHEST; *for thou shalt go before the face of the* LORD *to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God; whereby* THE DAY-SPRING *from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.* Luke 1. 76—79.

123.* The Angel, after the birth of our Saviour, gave the shepherds to understand, that there was something very extraordinary in his character:—*And there were in the country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. And, lo, the Angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them; and they were sore afraid. And the Angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is* CHRIST THE LORD.—*Suddenly there was with the Angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men.* Luke 2. 8—14.

124. The testimony of good old Simeon is much the same with all the former:—*There was a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the* CONSOLATION *of Israel: and the Holy Ghost was upon him. And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ. And he came by the Spirit into the temple. And when the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law, then took he him up in his arms, and blessed God, and said, Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy* SALVATION, *which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a* LIGHT *to lighten the Gentiles, and the* GLORY *of thy people Israel.* Luke 2. 25—32.

125. St. Matthew's account of his birth is well known:—*Now*, says he, *the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the* HOLY GHOST. *Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the* HOLY GHOST. *And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name* EMMANUEL; *which, being interpreted, is* GOD WITH US.[1] Some writers would insinuate,

[1] Mat. 1. 18—23. See Whitby on the place.

sinuate, that St. Matthew may here mean the Father; but a bare perusal of the passage will easily refute the supposition. The text is plain and full to the contrary. It is then pretended, that the name *Emmanuel* proves nothing more, in point of argument, than the names of places, such as Jehovah-Jireh, Jehovah-Shammah, Jehovah-Shalom, Jehovah-Nissi, and the like. In answer to this surmise, we will throw into the bottom of the page the reasoning of bishop Pearson upon it;* and I would observe, that most, if

* "That the name of God invested by way of excellency with "an article is attributed in the scriptures unto Christ, may thus be "made good. He who is called Emmanuel is named God by way of "excellency; for that name, saith St. Matthew, *being interpreted, is* GOD *with us*, and in that interpretation the Greek article is "prefixed. But Christ is called EMMANUEL; *that it might be "fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet; saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and "they shall call his name* EMMANUEL. Therefore he is that God "with us, which is expressed by way of excellency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honoured with that name. "For it is a vain imagination to think that Christ is called EMMANUEL, but that he is not what he is called: as Moses built an "altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-Nissi, and Gideon another called Jehovah-Shalom; and yet neither altar was Jehovah: "as Jerusalem was called *the Lord our Righteousness*, and yet that "city was not the Lord. Because these two notions, which are "conjoined in the name EMMANUEL, are severally true of Christ. "First, he is EMMANU, that is, *with us*, for he hath *dwelt "among us*: and when he parted from the earth, he said to his disciples, *I am with you alway, even to the end of the world*. Secondly, he is EL, and that name was given him, as the same Prophet "testifieth; *for unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and "his name shall be called* WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, *the* "MIGHTY GOD. He then who is both properly called EL, that "is, GOD, and is also really EMMANU, that is, with us, he must "infallibly be that EMMANUEL who is *God with us*. Indeed, if "the name EMMANUEL were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, God is with us, as the Lord our righteousness, and the "Lord is there, must be understood where they are the names of "Jerusalem; then should it have been the name not of Christ, but "of his church: and if we under the gospel had been called so,

if not all the Fathers of the church, from Irenæus downwards, always considered this text as a proof that Christ was possessed of real and proper divinity.[3]

Let us now pass on to what John the Baptist, and forerunner of our Lord, hath delivered concerning him. His evidence is confined within a narrow compass, but yet it is stronger and fuller than any of the former, and confirmative of all the predictions which had gone before concerning him. His words are these:—

126.* *I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose;* HE *shall baptize you with the* HOLY GHOST, *and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable.*[4] Luke 3. 16, 17.

127.* *John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was*

" it would have received no other interpretation in reference to us. " But being it is not ours, but our Saviour's name, it bears no kind " of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly " and directly to be attributed to the Messias as the name of Jesus. " Wherefore it remaineth that Christ be acknowledged God with us, " according to the evangelical interpretation, with an expression of " that excellency which belongeth to the Supreme Deity."

On the Creed, art. 2. p. 130.

[3] See Irenæus, lib. 3. cap. 21, and lib. 4. cap. 66.—Tertul. adv. Jud. cap. 9, et cont. Marc. lib. 3. cap. 12. Vide et cont. Prax. cap. 27.—Novat. cap. 12.—Cyp. Test. lib. 2. cap. 6.—Eus. Comment. in Is. 7. 14.

[4] The reader will be much edified by a perusal of the Rev. Dr. Bell's Enquiry into the Divine Missions of John the Baptist, and Jesus Christ. It is an able and ingenious performance. And it will be convenient to peruse carefully his Arguments for the authenticity of the two first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke's gospels. They appear to me decisive. See too the learned Dr. Campbell on the Four Gospels, vol. 1. p. 358, where he delivers in few words the substance of all that can be advanced on the authenticity of the two chapters in St. Matthew.

was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for HE WAS BEFORE ME.[5] *And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time:* THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON, *which* IS *in the* BOSOM OF THE FATHER, *he hath declared him.*[6] John 1. 15—18.

128.* *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of* THE LORD, *as said the prophet Esaias.* John 1. 23. Compare Is. 40. 3.

129. *The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the* LAMB[7] OF GOD WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD.[8] *This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for* HE WAS BEFORE ME.[9] *And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore I am come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record, that this is the* SON OF GOD. John 1. 29—34.

130.* And again, on another occasion, we find the same faithful witness addressing the cavilling Jews in the following strain:—*A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven. Ye yourselves bear me witness that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom,*

[5] Here is a clear declaration of Christ's pre-existence.
[6] This is a declaration of Christ's immensity.
[7] See Whitby on the place.
[8] This passage contains the doctrine of atonement.
[9] Behold here the pre-existence of the Saviour.

groom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease. HE THAT COMETH FROM ABOVE IS ABOVE ALL: *he that is of the earth is earthly and speaketh of the earth:* HE THAT COMETH FROM HEAVEN IS ABOVE ALL. *And what he hath* SEEN *and* HEARD,[1] *that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony. He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true. For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the* SON, and HATH GIVEN ALL THINGS INTO HIS HAND. *He that believeth on the* SON *hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the* SON *shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.* John 3. 27—36.

131.* Nathaniel, whom our Saviour dignified with the appellation of *an Israelite indeed in whom was no guile*, struck with a proof of his omniscience, cried out, *Rabbi, thou art the* SON *of God; thou art the King of Israel*;[2] thou art he who for so many ages hast been considered as the King of the Jews.

132. Martha, the sister of Lazarus and Mary, was no stranger to the character of Jesus. *I believe*, said this good woman, *that thou art the Christ, the* SON *of God, which should come into the world.* John 11. 27.

133. The confession of Peter is of a similar kind:—*Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the* SON *of the living God.* John 6. 68, 69.

134.* *When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say,*

[1] Here are in this passage three declarations of Christ's preexistence.

[2] John 1. 49.

say, that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, Some say, that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others Jeremias, or one of the Prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the SON *of the living God.* Mat. 16. 13—16. Our Saviour was much pleased with the frank and noble confession which Peter had made in the name of all his other disciples, and declared, that he had come to the knowledge of his real character by no ordinary means. *Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.* Mat. 16. 17. He then proceeds to inform the zealous Apostle, that upon this confession, of his being the Son of God, his church should be founded, and all the powers of darkness should never prevail against it: *And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Mat. 16. 18, 19. If to the above confession of Peter we add the declaration which he made upon another occasion, LORD, THOU KNOWEST ALL THINGS, *thou knowest that I love thee,* [3] it will appear, that even then, before the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, he had a very exalted opinion of the character of Jesus.

135. And when the Wise Men *were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down, and worshipped him: and when they*

[3] John 21. 17. See Whitby on the place.

had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense, and myrrh.[4]

This was the testimony of Heathens to the divinity of Jesus. We find all his own Apostles together acknowledging the same thing:—

136.* *Now*, say they, *we are sure that* THOU KNOWEST ALL THINGS, *and needest not that any man should ask thee; by this we believe, that* THOU CAMEST FORTH FROM GOD. John 16. 30. Here we have both the omniscience and pre-existence of the Redeemer.

137. Upon our Lord's calming a violent tempest on the sea, the people of the ship came and paid him worship, saying, *Of a truth thou art the* SON *of God.*[5]

It is to be observed likewise, that our Saviour's greatest

[4] Mat. 2. 11. Tertullian says that the prophecy in the 72d psalm was fulfilled by the gifts made to the infant Saviour, and by the honour paid to him at Bethlehem by the wise men; "who, when they "knew him honoured him with gifts, and, believing in Christ, on "their knees adored him as their God and King." Adv. Judæos, cap. 9.

Origen was of the same opinion:—"The wise men," says he, "conceiving our Lord to be greater than all their gods, resolved to "worship him, and coming into Judea they offered symbols to him, "who, if we may so speak, was compounded of God and mortal "man, gold as to a king, myrrh as to one who was to die, and frankincense as to God.—And, as he was God superior to the assistant "angels, being the Saviour of mankind, the angel rewarded their "piety in worshipping Jesus, by warning them not to return to "Herod." Adv. Celsum, lib. 1.

Then was fulfilled the prophecy of David—*The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents, and the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts.* Ps. 72. 10. This is what Tertullian alludes to above.

[5] Mat. 14. 33. "We never find that the Apostles accepted wor"ship, on account of the miracles done by them, but refused it "when offered with the utmost detestation; referring all worship to "the living God, and him only. It is strange that our blessed "Lord, who was all meekness and humility, should not have been "more resigned in this particular, had he been any thing less than "the eternal Son of God."

Fiddes's Theologia Speculativa, vol. 1. p. 412.

greatest adversaries, upon some occasions, bore very honourable, though undesigned testimony to his character. Pilate, the Roman governour, for instance, proclaimed to all the world upon the cross :—

138. *This is Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews*— intimating thereby, through the over-ruling providence of God, that Jesus was the person who had acted as king of Israel all through the Mosaic dispensation. Nor is the confession of the Heathen Centurion, when struck with amazement at the wonderful transaction of the crucifixion, to be disregarded :—

139. *Now when the Centurion, and they that were with him watching Jesus, saw the earth-quake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the* SON *of God.*[6]

But what is still more remarkable than either the testimony of Pilate or the Centurion, is, that even the Devils bore testimony to the divinity of our Saviour's character.

140. *For when he was come into the country of the Gergesenes there met him two possessed with devils, and they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou* SON *of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?* Mat. 8. 28, 29.

141. *And unclean spirits when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the* SON *of God. And he strictly charged them, that they should not make him known.* Mark 3. 11, 12.

142. *And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ, the* SON *of God. And he, rebuking them, suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ.* Luke 4. 41.

There is another testimony to the character of Jesus still higher than any of the former, which ought by no means to be passed over in silence.

[6] Mat. 27. 54.

For the God of heaven, his eternal Father, more than once bore witness from the clouds to the divinity of his Son.

143. *And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him; and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying,* THIS IS MY BELOVED SON, *in whom I am well pleased.* Mat. 3. 16, 17.

144. *While Peter yet spake, behold a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud which said,* THIS IS MY BELOVED SON, *in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him.* Mat. 17. 5. In both these places, and on both these occasions, it is not improbable but the Divine voice had an allusion to various parts of the Old Testament, and particularly to these words of the evangelical Prophet:—*Behold, my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.* Is. 42. 1. Comp. John 12. 28.

I will add here one more attestation to the superhuman, and super-angelical character of the Saviour of the world; and that is the attestation of the incredulous Thomas:—

145.* *And, after eight days again, his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands: and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said* UNTO HIM, MY LORD AND MY GOD![7] *Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou*

[7] St. Cyprian uses nearly the same expression:—"We should labour with all our industry and application to gain the favour of "Christ the Judge, both our Lord and our God." Epist. 60.

thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.[s] It should seem, that if Jesus were but a mere man, he ought to have reproved Thomas for such an address. The Apostles did so upon similar occasions, and so did even the Angels themselves, when their characters were misunderstood by their adorers. But we never find that our Saviour rejected

[s] John 20. 26—29. See Whitby on the place.—A learned and able defender of the divinity of Christ hath represented this address of St. Thomas in the following striking manner:—"It was a very "surprising thing, that Jesus, when he appeared to Thomas, after "his resurrection, should suffer him to cry out, *My Lord, and my "God!* without saying a word to him about the impiety and blas-"phemy of an exclamation, which treats the creature as if he were "the Creator. Thomas, before, was an unbeliever; now he is an "idolater. Till that instant he would not believe that Jesus was "risen; he considered him as a man lying under the power of "death; but now, on a sudden, he addresses him, as God; he bows "and adores. Of the two extremes, the latter is most condem-"nable; for unbelief is not so criminal as idolatry. That dishonour-"ing Jesus Christ; this usurping the throne of God. Better for "Thomas, therefore, to have persisted in his unbelief, than, by re-"nouncing it, to fall into idolatry.—And yet, strange indeed! "strange to astonishment; who can account for it? Jesus upbraids "him only with the former; not at all with the latter." See Abbadie on the Divinity of Christ, by Booth, p. 24.

Another learned Author observes upon this profession of St. Thomas:—"After Christ was risen, when he was pleased to satisfy "St. Thomas's scruples about the truth of his resurrection, Thomas, "being convinced, answered and said unto him, *My Lord and my "God.* This his confession of faith our Saviour accepted and ap-"proved of—*Jesus saith unto him—Thomas, because thou hast seen "me, thou hast believed.*—But, if he had not been really God, he "would surely rather have corrected his Apostle, than accepted of "his confession." See Randolph's Vindication, part 2. p. 52.

For a fuller vindication of this text see Bishop Pearson on the Creed, art. p. 131.

Dr. Clarke thus paraphrases the text:—"Thou art indeed my "Lord, the same that was crucified: and I acknowledge thy Al-"mighty power in having triumphed over death, and adore thee as "my God."

Thus too Dr. Hammond:—"I acknowledge that thou art my "very Lord and Master, and that is an evidence that thou art the "omnipotent God of heaven."

jected any adoration, or ascriptions of honour that were given to him by persons who rightly apprehended his pretensions. He was therefore either more than man, or with an ill grace it was that he could say, *Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls*; and claim to himself the exalted honour of being *the faithful and true witness.*

PART SECOND.

SECTION II.

The testimony of CHRIST himself, concerning his own PERSON and CHARACTER.

LET us next attend to what our Saviour himself spake at various times, and upon different occasions, concerning his own dignity. He was, indeed, very sparing of self-commendation, and seemed rarely to discover his pretensions to the world, except closely pressed so to do by some or other of his adversaries. [1]

And

[1] "We must confess that our Lord has not so plainly and positively delivered this doctrine of his divinity, as afterwards his Apostles did. His enemies sought all opportunities to lay hold of his words, while the people, and his own disciples, were ready on the least encouragement to proclaim him their king. On both these accounts he found himself obliged to speak, and act with great caution and reserve. We scarce ever find him in express and positive terms declaring himself the Christ, though the whole tenor of his life and doctrine gave strong intimations of this truth. In like manner, and for the same reasons, we shall find his divinity rather strongly intimated, than expressly taught." Randolph's Vindication, p. 2. p. 37.

The learned Dr. Burnet is of the same opinion. "I do not re-

And the reason he gives for his conduct in this respect, is perfectly consistent with the general tenor of all the former divine dispensations. *I have many things to say unto you*, my disciples, said he a little before his death, *but ye cannot bear them now*, while I am with you in this low disguise. Your minds are not yet sufficiently prepared. *Nevertheless when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* John 16. 12—14. All this plainly implies that there was something in the character of Jesus with which his disciples were at that time not fully acquainted, and with which they should continue to be unacquainted till after the effusion of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. It is, therefore, in the writings of the Apostles, after that time, we are to look for a *full* manifestation of the character of Jesus, and the doctrines of the gospel. All former dispensations were growingly clearer, and preparatory to this. But the dispensation of the Spirit, after the ascension of our Lord into heaven, was to be the last and most satisfactory of all. These things being premised, we will now produce a number of our Saviour's own declarations respecting his person, character, and mission.

146. He

" member," says he, " that Christ openly says in the gospel, that " he is God: but Thomas the Apostle made use of that name in " the hearing of Christ without reprehension, John 20. 28. And " the Jews seem to have understood the words of Christ in that " manner, John 5. 18. and 10. 30, &c. And Christ himself in- " stituted a new form of baptism in the name of the Father, Son, " and Holy Spirit, Mat. 28. 19. and commanded that *all should* " *honour the Son, as they honour the Father*, John 5. 23. and said " that *all things which the Father hath are his*, 16. 15. Where- " fore, if there be no crime in so saying, Christ spake too presump- " tuously of himself, and heard others to speak so likewise, if he " knew himself, in the mean time, to be no more but a mere man; " and permitted the error of others without correction."

De Fide et Officiis, p. 119.

146. He was the promised and long expected Messiah. This he avowed upon several occasions. We will only mention two. The one was to the woman of Samaria, and the other to a blind man whom he had restored to sight. *I know*, says the former, *that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.—Dost thou believe on the Son of God?* said Jesus to the latter. *He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him.* John 9. 35—37.

He existed before he was born of the virgin Mary.[a] Notwithstanding the difficulty of conceiving how this could be, I cannot see how any person can reasonably doubt of it, who is disposed to give the least credit to his own declarations. Indeed,

" I know the learned can with ease
" Twist words and meanings as they please:

But to plain, honest men, I believe, the following clear

[a] Both the orthodox scheme, which supposes Christ was God before he was born of the Virgin; and the Arian scheme, which supposes he was a glorious Being, superior to the angels before he took on him human nature; and the high Socinian hypothesis, which considers Christ as begotten in a supernatural manner by the Holy Ghost: are encumbered with difficulties inscrutable by the highest powers of human reason. Dr. Priestley, therefore, to rid himself of all these incumberances at once rejects each of the above schemes as equally improbable, and supposes that Christ was begotten of Joseph and the Virgin, so called, according to the common course of procreation. Thus, in order to get clear of one difficulty, he involves himself in many. For if Christ did not exist before he was born into the world, in some capacity or other, the whole bible is only calculated to mislead and deceive. The following passages will bear witness to this declaration.

clear testimonies from the mouth of him who cannot lie, and who never did cozen or mislead mankind, will be abundantly satisfactory.

147.* *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but* HE THAT CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN,[3] *even the Son of man,* WHICH IS IN HEAVEN.[4] John 3. 13.

148.* *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For* THE BREAD OF GOD IS HE WHICH COMETH DOWN FROM HEAVEN, *and giveth life unto the world.—For* I CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN, *not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.—The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread*

 which

[3] "Nothing can be more unreasonable and groundless than the "Socinians interpretation of this passage; who feign that Christ "was taken up into heaven, as Moses of old into the mount, to "receive his instructions; and then came down again to preach. "Whereas the plain meaning is, that he was in the beginning with "God, before he was made flesh, and came into the world."
Clarke on the Trinity, p. 84.

[4] "As he is God, his throne is in the heavens, and he fills all "things by his immensity: as he is man, he is circumscribed by an "uneasy cradle, and cries in a stable. As he is God, he is seated "upon a super-exalted throne: as man, exposed to the lowest estate "of uneasiness and need. As God, clothed in a robe of glory, at "the same instant when you may behold and wonder at his humanity wrapped in cheap and unworthy cradle-bands. As God, he "is incircled with millions of angels; as man, in the company of "beasts. As God, he is the eternal Word of the Father eternal, "sustained by himself, all-sufficient, and without need: and yet he "submitted himself to a condition imperfect, inglorious, indigent "and necessitous." Bishop Taylor's Life of Christ, p. 13.

Tertullian writes to the same purpose: "You have the Son on "earth, you have the Father in heaven. It is not a separation, but "a divine disposition. Yet you ought to know, that God is also "within the abysses, and exists every where; but it is by his might "and power; and likewise that the Son is every where with him, "as not divided from him. In the dispensation, however, the Father would have the Son to dwell on earth, and himself in heaven." Adv. Prax. c. 23.

which came down from heaven, And they said, Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN?[5] —*Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God,* HE HATH SEEN THE FATHER.—THIS IS THE BREAD WHICH COMETH DOWN FROM HEAVEN, *that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread* WHICH CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN.—*This is that bread* WHICH CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN.—*What, and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up* WHERE HE WAS BEFORE?[6]

149. And

[5] Novatian, quoting the words, *Ye know not whence I came, nor whither I go*, proceeds, "Behold here he says, that he will return "thither, whence he declares he came before. He was sent from "heaven. He descended then whence he came, as he goes thither, "whence he descended. Wherefore, if Christ had only been a "man, he had not come thence; but by coming from whence man "cannot come, he shewed himself to have been God who came.— "As man could not come from heaven, so as to challenge a return "thither, he must be God, who descended thence, whence man "could not come." De Trinit. Cap. 23.

[6] John 6 ch. passim. Dr. Price says—"The Jews understood "our Lord's expression to be an intimation, that he had existed in "heaven before he came into this world, and therefore murmured "at him, and said, *Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father "and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down "from heaven?* There is in this case," continues the Doctor, "a "presumption, that the sense in which the Jews understood our Lord, "was the most obvious and natural sense. If, however, it was not, "and the Jews perversely misinterpreted his words, it was reason- "able to expect, that he would have said something to correct their "mistake. But instead of this, we find, that, in his reply, he re- "peated the same declaration in stronger language, and intimated "that they understood him rightly; *Does this offend you? What and "if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* Ser- mons, p. 132.

The same Gentleman saith again: "I must think this text as "decisive a declaration of Christ's pre-existence by himself as "words can well express."

Another able Writer observes upon this subject; "Whether our "Saviour had an existence in heaven with God the Father before "his incarnation, I think one may safely rest the decision of this

149.* And Jesus said unto the Jews, *Ye are from beneath; I* AM FROM ABOVE: *Ye are of this world; I* AM NOT OF THIS WORLD. John 8. 23.

150.* *I speak that* WHICH I HAVE SEEN WITH MY FATHER. John 8. 38.

151.* *Jesus said unto the Jews, If God were your Father, ye would love me; for* I PROCEEDED FORTH AND CAME FROM GOD; *neither came I of myself, but* HE SENT ME. John 8. 42.

152.* *Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that* HE WAS COME FROM GOD, *and went to God.** John 13. 3.

153.* *All things that* I HAVE HEARD OF MY FATHER, *I have made known unto you.* John 15. 15.

154.* *These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: but the time cometh when I shall speak no more unto you in proverbs, but I shall shew you plainly of the Father. At that day ye shall ask in my name; and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you: for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me,* AND HAVE BELIEVED, THAT I CAME OUT FROM GOD. I CAME FORTH FROM THE FATHER, *and am come into the world: again, I leave the world and go to the Father. His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. Now are we sure, that* THOU KNOWEST ALL THINGS, *and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that* THOU CAMEST FORTH FROM GOD.[7]

" question with a Turk or an Indian, or any other plain, honest, up-
" right person in the world, who could read our New Testament.
Harwood's Socinian Scheme, p. 31.

[7] John 16. 25—30.—" The argument in favour of our Lord's
" pre-existence is exceedingly strengthened from the consideration
" of the very familiar manner in which Christ occasionally speaks
" of the glories of heaven. The difference between our Lord and
" his Apostles, even after their inspiration, in this particular is very

* This is St. John's testimony.

From these words it is most evident our Saviour's disciples understood him as declaring, that he came down from heaven into the world. It was equally clear he did not endeavour to correct their wrong apprehensions, which, one should naturally suppose, he would and ought to have done, if they had really misunderstood his meaning. It follows, therefore, as justly and forcibly as any conclusion in dialectics well can do, that the disciples understood their Lord and Master in a proper manner, and that he actually was in heaven before he was born of the Virgin, and came down from thence for the salvation of the world. [8]

155.* *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee* BEFORE THE WORLD WAS. [9]

156. Again:

" observable. They seem to be lost in the contemplation, when-
" ever they have occasion to describe the heavenly state, and ap-
" pear to be oppressed with the weight of the subject; but with
" Jesus nothing can seem to be more natural and familiar." ' It is
' like a prince,' says Doddridge, ' who having been educated in a
' splendid court, could speak with ease of many magnificent things
' at the sudden view of which a peasant would be swallowed up in
' astonishment, and would find himself greatly embarrassed in an
' attempt to explain them to his equals at home.'

" Whoever compares the plain representation our blessed Lord
" hath given of heaven, with the laboured expressions of the Apos-
" tles upon this subject, will be struck with the justness of this
" observation, and no inconsiderable argument will arise therefrom,
" of our Lord's pre-existence in glory."

Hawker's Sermons, p. 44, 45.

[8] " Cannot one know (says an excellent writer, thoroughly con-
" versant in these subjects) that the Socinian interpretation of John
" 1. 1. and Heb. 1. 10. or of the texts relating to Christ's pre-exis-
" tence, is not the mind of scripture? Yea, one may know it as cer-
" tainly, as that a counter is not the king's coin, or that a monster
" is not a man."

[9] John 17. 5. " The Socinians interpretation of this passage is
" too much forced; who understand it to signify only the glory
" which Christ had in the foreknowledge and prædetermination of
" God." Clarke on the Trinity, p. 103.

Dr. Harwood says of this scripture, " Were there no intimation in the whole New Testament of the pre-existence of Christ, this

156.* Again:—*I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have* KNOWN SURELY THAT I CAME OUT FROM THEE, *and they have believed that* THOU DIDST SEND ME. John 17. 8.

157.* And again:—*Father, I will that they also be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me; for* THOU LOVEDST ME BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD. John 17. 24.

To my apprehension nothing can be clearer from all these passages, than that our blessed Saviour meant to assert his own pre-existence. [1] Great art and perversion must be used to make them speak a different language. Nay, many of our Socinians are so sensible of this, that they are obliged to suppose, by way of getting clear of them as cleverly as may be, that Jesus was taken up into heaven

single passage would irrefragably demonstrate, and establish it. Our Saviour, here in a solemn act of devotion, declares to the Almighty, that he had glory with *him* before the world was, and fervently supplicates that he would be graciously pleased to *reinstate* him in his *former* felicity. The language is plain and clear. Every word hath great moment and emphasis:—*Glorify thou me with that glory which I enjoyed in thy presence, and near thy person, before the world was.*—Upon this single text I lay my finger. Here I posit my system."

Of the Socinian Scheme, p. 47.

[1] The Fathers are unanimous in this doctrine:—"The Son of "God," says Hermas, "is more ancient than all creatures, inso- "much that he was present in consult with his Father at the making "of the creature." Pastor, Sim. 9.

"Who was with the Father," says Ignatius, "before all ages, "and appeared at the end of the world." Epist. ad Mag. sect. 6.

Justin Martyr to the same purpose:—"But the Son of the Fa- "ther, even he who alone is properly called his Son, the Word "which was with him before the creation, because by him he in the "beginning made and disposed all things; he, &c." Apol. 1.

And again:—"But this Being, who was really begotten of the "Father, and proceeded from him, did before all creatures were "made, exist with the Father, and the Father conversed with him."

Dialog. cum Tryph.

heaven before he entered upon his public ministry, and instructed in what he was to do, and what he was to say.[2] But the reader will observe, this is making scripture, and not interpreting it. And, if we are allowed to take those liberties with the word of God, there is an end of all certainty. It shall be any thing or nothing just as pleases our fancy. I conclude, therefore, upon true scriptural principles, that Jesus Christ did really and properly pre-exist, and consequently, that the Socinian scheme is subverted root and branch, and can never be established, but upon the ruin of scripture, and all just and authentic interpretation. Let the reader, however, judge for himself.

158.* The conversation which our Saviour held with his countrymen, where he declares himself prior to the Father of the faithful, is very remarkable. *Your father Abraham*, says he, *rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you*, BEFORE ABRAHAM WAS, I AM.[3] *Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple,*

[2] See this matter discussed at large in Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 133, &c.

[3] "The Socinian interpretation of this passage is very languid "and unnatural; that Christ was before Abraham in the foreknowledge and appointment of God. The plain meaning is, that he "was really *with God in the beginning*, and *before the world was*." John 1. 1; and 17. 5.

"Many expositors, from our Saviour's using in this passage the "words, *I am*, instead of, *I was* (though the like manner of speaking is found also in other places of this gospel; as ch. 14. 9) "conclude that he here refers to his own peculiar manner of existence. And indeed, that possibly he might hereby intend to insinuate "his derivation of being from the Father, to have been in a singular "manner, incomprehensible and unrevealed; and that he was that "person in whom the name of God was; namely, that he was that "visible person, who in the Old Testament appeared and was called "JEHOVAH, or I AM; this, I say, cannot indeed positively be de-

temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by.[4]

It is evident from the context, that the Jews understood

" nied. But to suppose that he here describes himself to be ab-
" solutely, the self-existing being or person (ο ων, or το ον)
" this is downright Sabellianism, and directly contrary to the whole
" tenor of scripture." Clarke on the Trinity, p. 88.

These are the observations of Dr. Clarke upon this celebrated text. Bishop Sherlock has done it more justice. " Our blessed " Saviour claims to himself that awful name I AM, which belongs " only to the Supreme Being; *Before Abraham was, I AM.* Had " our Saviour only said, *Before Abraham was*, I was; thus much at " least would have been the consequence, that he had an existence " before Abraham: but now that he says, *Before Abraham was*, " I AM; something more is implied; something that peculiarly " belongs to the expression I AM, and what that is, we may learn " from the original use of the words. They are the words which " God made choice of to express his own eternity and power, when " Moses inquired after the name of God: he answered him, I AM " THAT I AM. *Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel*, I " AM *hath sent me unto you.* Ex. 3. 14. What now could tempt " our Saviour to use and apply this expression to himself? He knew " that it never had been applied to any but God, and would have " been in the man so applying it, in the highest degree, committing " the *robbery* of making himself *equal with God.* Besides, accord- " ing to analogy of language, the words, without this construction, " express nothing: no idea belongs to them; for a man cannot " in his mind carry the present time back, and make it antecedent to " the time already past; and therefore to say, *Before a thing was*, " I AM, is shuffling ideas together, which can have no place in " the understanding. If, therefore, you admit the expression to " have any meaning, you must allow the I AM to belong to Christ, " in its proper and peculiar use, as signifying eternity and perma- " nency of duration." Discourse 1st. vol. 4.

Dr. Harwood says, " This plain declaration of our Saviour, will, " I think, forever stand in full force against all the acumen of cri- " ticism and sagacity of refinement which may be employed to in- " validate and explain away its natural and obvious signification." Of the Socinian Scheme, p. 40.

[4] John 8. 56—59. Novatian observes upon this passage, " If " Christ be only a man, how does he say, *Before Abraham*, I AM? " He either therefore speaks falsely and deceives, if he was not be- " fore Abraham, who was from Abraham. Or he doth not deceive, " if he is also God, while he was before Abraham." Cap. 23. 26. Let the Reader consult the 44th. of Tillotson's Sermons; Dr.

derstood our Saviour as asserting his own divinity, or at least his own pre-existence; for they immediately took up stones to cast at him.[5] And he, without making the smallest apology for what he had said, or attempting in the least to explain himself to any other sense, exerted his supernatural power, and escaped out of their hands, leaving them in full possession of the opinion they had formed concerning him.

Two other passages of the New Testament, spoken by our Saviour himself, are of similar import. Nor can they be fairly interpreted, in my judgment, but upon the supposition of the pre-existence of the Son of God. We may indeed deny the truth of any proposition, warp it to any meaning we please, and even assert that black is white, but men whose minds are honest and simple dare not do so. They conceive not that they have any right to form their religious system as they please, but are bound to receive that which God hath thought proper to reveal.—But, to the passages in question:—

159.* *While the Pharisees were gathered together Jesus asked*

Whitby on the passage, who has ably vindicated it from the perversions of the Socinians; and Whitaker's Origin of Arianism Disclosed, p. 26—29.

Dr. Price remarks upon this scripture, that "it is a circumstance "of some consequence, that the words were occasioned by an of- "fence which Jesus had given the Jews by an expression which "they thought implied, that he had existed in the days of Abra- "ham."

See his Sermons, p. 133.

[5] "It is plain that our Saviour's audience," says Dr. Harwood, "took these words in their natural acceptation; for upon his asserting to them, that he was in being before their great ancestor, "they were instantly transported into the last excesses of fury "against him as a blasphemer and impostor, and took up stones "with a design to murder him. These actual violences of the "Jews, prove, I apprehend, better than a thousand inane and chimerical theories, *how* our Redeemer was understood, and *intended* "to be understood."

Of the Socinian Scheme, p. 41.

asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right-hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? IF DAVID THEN CALL HIM LORD, HOW IS HE HIS SON?[6]

160. The other scripture to which I referred is in the book of Revelation: I AM THE ROOT AND THE OFFSPRING OF DAVID, *and the bright and morning star.*[7]

If all these passages taken together, and considered as explanatory one of another, prove not the pre-existence[8] of the Son of God, I confess myself incompetent to judge of the nature of any evidence whatever.

Pass we on now to various other declarations of the Son of God concerning himself, which convey, or seem to convey, sentiments utterly inconsistent with every idea of his being but a mere human creature.

[6] Mat. 22. 41—45. "Let any man of a plain common understanding read this passage as it stands in the New Testament, and then determine for himself; will it not instantly strike him, that our blessed Lord meant to infer, that something above the nature of an human being was appointed to distinguish the character of the Messiah? that, notwithstanding Christ, according to the flesh, was to spring from the seed of David, yet, at the same time, he was to be David's Lord? That our Saviour's argument was considered in this light by his hearers, and that it wrought a conviction of this kind upon their minds, seems highly probable; for the Evangelist adds, *They were not able to answer him a word, neither durst any man, from that day forth, ask him any more questions.*"

Hawker's Sermons, p. 19.

[7] Rev. 22. 16.

[8] "Some of these passages, when detached from their proper places in scripture, or from each other, may appear, perhaps, susceptible of other meanings: but when compared with each other, and especially with the passages, in which Christ asserts his divinity, they carry only one meaning, the pre-existence of Christ, and the union in him of the divine and human nature."

Burgess's Sermon on the Divinity of Christ, p. 14.

161. *All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man* KNOWETH THE SON *but the* FATHER; *neither knoweth any man the* FATHER, *save the* SON, *and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.*[9]

These words evidently declare, as Dr. Doddridge justly observes, that there is something inexplicably mysterious in the nature and person of Jesus.

162. *As the* FATHER *knoweth* ME, *even so know* I *the* FATHER.[1]

What strange, arrogant language would this be, upon the supposition he were no more than a mere

[9] Mat. 11. 27. If Christ was no more than a mere man, how do these words consist with the following declaration, *I am meek and lowly in heart?*

"The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," saith Irenæus, "manifests and reveals himself to all, whom he is at all revealed to, "by his Word who is his Son. For they know the Father, to "whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Now the Son, co-existing "always with the Father, reveals the Father of old, even always "from the beginning, to Angels and Archangels, and Powers and "Dominions, and to men, whom God thinks fit to reveal himself "to." Lib. 2. cap. 55.

Mr. Burgess in his late excellent Sermon before the University of Oxford, on the Divinity of Christ, observes on this passage of holy scripture, that, "when our Saviour addressed these words to the "Jews, who were present with him, and before whom he had been "accustomed to call God his Father, and himself the Son, he must "have referred to some invisible nature distinct from his human "person. It is clear from our Saviour's words, that the Father and "the Son were equally unknown to mankind, and consequently, "that the Son in his invisible and essential nature, was equally di-"vine with the Father." Page 13.

[1] John 10. 15.—"When thou hearest the title Father," saith Ruffinus, "understand that he hath a Son, who is the image of his "substance; for, as no man is called a Lord, unless he hath a ser-"vant or a possession, which he lords it over; and no man is called "a Master, except he hath a scholar: so no one can in any manner "be called a Father, unless he hath a Son. By this name, there-"fore, by which God is called a Father, the Son is also demonstrat-"ed to subsist likewise with him."

Exposit. in Symb. Apost. sect. 4.

mere man? Instead of being a teacher come from God to instruct mankind in the divine will, he might rather, in that case, be considered as a blasphemer and vain-glorious boaster.

163. *What thinkest thou, Simon? Of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the* CHILDREN *free.* Mat. 17. 25, 26.

In this beautiful little piece of history our Saviour seems to insinuate, that, because he himself was the Son of the great King, to whom heaven, earth, and sea, with all things in them belong, he was not obliged to pay tribute, as holding any thing by a derived right from any king whatever. As a mere man he could have had no just pretence to any such exemption. The whole force of the passage consists in, or depends upon, our Lord's being the true, proper, and natural Son of God, and is illustrative and confirmative of all those scriptures which speak of God as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

164. *The* SON *of man is* LORD *even of the* SABBATH DAY.[2]

Does not this declaration carry us back to the original institution of the sabbath? And does it seem decent for a *mere* man to make use of language like this? There is an arrogance in such a pretension infinitely unsuitable to the character of simple humanity.

165. *If two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name; there am* I *in the midst of them.*[3]

[2] Mat. 12. 8. See Whitby on Mat. 12. 2.

[3] Mat. 18. 19, 20.—Novatian saith, "If Christ were only a "man, how is he present wheresoever he is called upon, since this

This passage is spoken by our blessed Saviour himself; and I appeal to the reader whether or no it contains sentiments proper for a *mere* man. The person whose language it is, evidently claims the two divine attributes of Omnipresence and Omniscience.

166. *God so loved the world, that* HE GAVE HIS ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON, *that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.*[4]

Where was the extraordinary love of God to the world, if Jesus was nothing more than a mere man? Upon the supposition that he was of an higher order, and God's own proper Son, all is natural and easy.[5] On any other principle, one of the finest and most important passages of the whole bible, is rendered absurd and ridiculous.

167. When our Saviour was only twelve years of age, he claimed kindred with heaven in a very peculiar

" is not the nature of man, but of God, that he can be present in " every place." Ch. 14.

And again on Mat. 28. 20:—" God is therefore with us; yea " much more, he is even in us." Cap. 12.

[4] John 3. 16. See Whitby on the place.

[5] " It is certain that the love of God towards us is greatly exalted " in that he sent his only-begotten Son into the world, and gave him " up to the death of the cross, to save sinners, the children of " wrath. But if the Son of God denotes no more than Jesus, " born of the virgin, we cannot see so clearly why this love should " be so greatly extolled, as if it denotes the Son, whom he begat " before ages. For the Son, born of the virgin, was therefore " born of her, that he might die for sinners. Now, where was the " extraordinary love of God, in giving up that Son to death, who " was begotten of the virgin, by his pleasure, and conceived of the " Holy Spirit for that purpose? But if you conceive it to be the " Son of God, who was begotten of the Father before ages, who " was under no necessity of being sent into the world, whose digni- " ty was greater than that he should be sent, or come in the flesh, " much less die, who seemed dearer to the Father, than that he " should force him upon so much calamity; then, indeed, the splen- " dour and glory of the Divine love towards mankind shines forth " greatly."

Episcopius, vol. 1. p. 337.

liar sense, by saying to his human parents, *Wist ye not that I must be about* MY FATHER'S *business?* —Or, as it ought rather, perhaps, to be translated, *Wist ye not that I must be in* MY FATHER'S *house?* Does not our blessed Lord by this interrogation, under such circumstances, indirectly declare, that Joseph was not his natural and proper father? Luke 2. 48.

168. *I am not alone; but I and* THE FATHER *that sent me.* John 8. 16.

169. *I am one that bear witness of myself, and* THE FATHER *that sent me beareth witness of me. Then said they unto him, Where is thy Father? Jesus answered, Ye neither know me nor* MY FATHER: *if ye had known me, ye should have known* MY FATHER *also.* John 8. 18, 19.

170. *As* MY FATHER *hath taught me, I speak these things.*—THE FATHER *hath not left me alone.* John 8. 28, 29.

171.* *The servant abideth not in the house forever; but* THE SON *abideth ever. If* THE SON, *therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.* John 8. 35, 36. This shews that Christ is the natural and proper Son of God. Compare Mat. 17. 24—27.

172. *I speak that which I have seen with* MY FATHER. John 8. 38.

173. *I honour* MY FATHER. John 8. 49.

174. *It is* MY FATHER *that honoureth me.* John 8. 54.

175. FATHER, *the hour is come; glorify* THY SON, *that* THY SON *also may glorify thee.* John 17. 1.

176. *And now,* O FATHER, *glorify thou me.* John 17. 5.

177. HOLY FATHER, *keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me.* John 17. 11.

178. *That they all may be one, as* THOU, FATHER, *art in me, and I in thee.* John 17. 21.

179. FATHER, *I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am.* John 17. 24.

180. O RIGHTEOUS FATHER, *the world hath not known thee.* John 17. 25.

181. *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to* MY FATHER, *and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?* Mat. 28. 53.

182. *And, behold, I send the promise of* MY FATHER *upon you.* Luke 24. 49.

183. *Take these things hence; make not* MY FATHER'S HOUSE, *an house of merchandise.* John 2. 16.

In all these cases, where Christ so familiarly calls God his Father, there seems to be an allusion to his true and proper sonship. To hear him speak in such a stile, and to suppose no more is meant by it, than that he was peculiarly beloved of God, seems by no means to satisfy that expectation, which arises from so frequent a repetition of such expressions as these, under such circumstances.[6]

184. *Destroy*

[6] There is a little work published in the nineteenth volume of the late Rev. John Wesley's Works, translated from the French, and entitled, A Treatise concerning the Godhead of Jesus Christ, which deserves the attention of all those who reject the divinity of our blessed Saviour. I do not say that every expression in it is justifiable, on the contrary I think some few savour of Sabellianism; but upon the whole, it is a serious pamphlet. The several propositions contained in the treatise are these: 1. If Jesus Christ is not of the same essence with the Father, the Christianity which we profess is the corruption of the Christian religion, and Mahometanism the re-establishment of it. 2. If Jesus Christ is not of the same essence with the Father, we must regard Mahomet as sent of God. 3. If Jesus Christ is not of one essence with the Father, Mahomet is a great prophet, the greatest of the prophets, and even preferable in all respects to Jesus Christ. 4. If Jesus Christ is not of the same essence with the Father, Mahomet was more true, more wise, more charitable, and more zealous for the glory of God than he. 5. That Jesus Christ takes the name of God. 6. That his disciples ascribe to Jesus Christ all the principal titles, which in the writings of the prophets form the idea of the supreme God, and essentially distinguish him from all creatures. 7. That the apostles make Jesus Christ equal with God. 8. That Jesus Christ required and received adoration. 9. That those passages in the Old Testament, which most incontestably contain the characters of the supreme God, are applied in the New to Jesus Christ.

184. *Destroy this temple, and in three days* I *will raise it up.* John 2. 19. See Acts 2. 24.

185. If this declaration of our Saviour is compared with that other of similar import—*I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again.* John 10. 18. It will appear that he had an actual and almighty existence at the very time his body was laying lifeless in the grave.[7]

186. *Jesus said unto Martha, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.* John 11. 25, 26. "If Jesus had been no more than a mere man, "such language would have appeared haughty "and assuming, and scarcely reconcileable with "his humility and submission to his Father."[8]

187. *Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.—Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master even Christ,* Mat. 23. 8, 10. These were titles usually bestowed by the Jews on their teachers and learned men, with much vain pomp and ceremony. Christ alone, however, had a right to such distinctions.—See an instructive note in Whitby on these verses.

188. *The*

[7] St. Ignatius says, "Jesus Christ did truly suffer, so also he "did truly raise up himself." Epist. ad Smyr.

Origen speaks more at large:—"Who," says he, "has broken "the snares of death, save he who alone could not be holden of "them? For though he was under the dominion of death, it was "voluntary, and not by the law of sin as we are. It was he alone "who was free among the dead. And because he was free among "the dead, having vanquished him who had the power of death, "he took away the bondage to death; and not only raised himself "from the dead, but at the same time raised up those also who were "detained in death." Hom. 3. in Cant. Canticorum.

St. Cyprian expresses the same sentiment:—"He dismissed his "spirit of his own accord; and of his own accord rose again on "the third day from the dead." De Vanit. Idol.

[8] Jortin's Sermons, vol. 6. p. 189.

188. *The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give* HIS LIFE A RANSOM *for many.* Mat. 20. 28. Here seems a plain intimation of that atonement, which he was, in due time, to make for the sins of the world, and which was more fully and circumstantially revealed after he had ascended into his glory.

189. *If a man love me he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.*[9] What strange, and even impudent language would this be, upon the supposition that Christ was no more than a *mere* man? Read it again and again, and see if there be not here an intercommunity between the FATHER and the SON by the SPIRIT inconsistent with every idea of simple humanity.

190. *Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in* GOD, *believe also in* ME. *In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you: I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know. Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way? Jesus saith unto him, I am the* WAY, *and the* TRUTH, *and the* LIFE: *no man cometh unto the Father but by* ME. *If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen* ME, *hath seen the* FATHER; *and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father? Believest*

[9] John 14. 23. It was a saying among the Jews, that if any one "sit and learn in the Law, the Schechinah will rest upon him."
Pirke Avoth. cap. 3. sect. 6.

est thou not that I am in the FATHER, *and the* FATHER *in* ME?[1] *The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: but the* FATHER *that* DWELLETH IN ME, *he doth the works. Believe me, that* I AM *in the* FATHER, *and the* FATHER *in* ME; *or else believe me for the very work's sake.—Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.—He that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him.—I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.—When the* COMFORTER *is come, whom I will send unto you from the* FATHER, *even the* SPIRIT OF TRUTH, *which proceedeth from the* FATHER, *he shall testify of* ME.—*It is expedient for you, that I go away: for if I go not away, the* COMFORTER *will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.—When the* COMFORTER *is come, he shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* ALL THINGS THAT THE FATHER HATH ARE MINE.[2]

[1] "Is this a stile proper, I do not say for any mere man, but to "the highest, or most perfect of all created beings? Let any So- "cinian, or Arian tell us, what occasion there was for a mere em- "bassador or agent between God and man, to assume so much "every where to himself, to lay so much stress upon his own per- "sonal dignity, to set forth his own personal powers and preroga- "tives, and, upon these grounds to demand honour and worship to "himself, together with the Father. Would it not have been suf- "ficient for him to have pressed and inculcated the doctrine of the "one God; the necessity of obedience to his laws; the rewards "attending it; and the penalties consequent upon the neglect of "it?"

See several other excellent thoughts upon the same subject in Fiddes's Theo. Spec. vol. 1. p. 416.

[2] "These are strong expressions, but must appear very strange "too, and unaccountable, if the Son were a creature only; or if "no more were meant by them than that he was a teacher sent from "God. If we may believe plain words spoken by our blessed Sa-

Let the serious reader judge, whether these various declarations of the Saviour of mankind are consistent with the character of simple manhood, however dignified by the favour of his Maker. Jesus Christ doth not say, I grant, in any of them, that he is the eternal Son of the eternal Father, but he saith many things which would be the highest blasphemy in any mere mortal man. Upon the supposition that he is the natural and proper Son of God, there is a propriety and consistency in the highest of them. And he might with the strictest decorum declare, ALL THINGS THAT THE FATHER[3] HATH ARE MINE.

191.* *And Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ tell us plainly. Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.*

" viour himself, here is a full proof of a perfect communication of " all things, and of an individual unity of power in the three persons " of the ever blessed Trinity, as could have been, supposing our " principles really true."

See Fiddes's Theo. Spec. vol. 1. p. 419.

[3] " Observe," saith St. Austin, " that when in the creed the " name of God the Father is conjoined, it is thereby declared, that " he was not first of all a God, and afterwards a Father; but with- " out any beginning, he is always both God and Father. When " thou hearest the word *Father*, acknowledge that he hath a *Son* " truly born, as he is called a possessor, who possesseth any thing, " and a governour who governs any thing: so God the Father is a " term of a secret mystery, whose true Son is the Word."

Serm. de Temp. Serm. 181.

hand. I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE.[4] *Then*

 the

[4] See Whitby on the place.—Doddridge hath this observation upon the declaration before us:—"If we attend, not only to the obvious meaning of these words, in comparison with other passages of scripture, but to the connexion of this celebrated text, it so plainly demonstrates the Deity of our blessed Redeemer, that I think it may be left to speak for itself, without any laboured comment. —How widely different that sense is, in which Christians are said to be *one with God*, John 17. 21, will sufficiently appear, by considering, how flagrantly absurd and blasphemous it would be, to draw that inference from their union with God, which Christ does from his."

Several of the ancient Fathers have quoted or alluded to this remarkable saying of our Lord—*I and my Father are one*—and have understood it pretty much in the same sense we usually do.

Athenagoras says:—"The Son of God is the Word of the Father, in power and energy. By him and through him were all things created: for *the Father and the Son are* ONE. The Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, by the unity and power of the Spirit: for the SON OF GOD is the WORD and WISDOM of God."* Apol. p. 10.

I shall insert here a passage from Bishop Brown's Letter against Toland's book on Christianity not mysterious, concerning the divinity of the Son of God. This Letter is designed not only as an answer to Toland's book, but to all the opposers of Revelation and Mysteries. His words are these:—"I am convinced by the completion of prophecies, the miracles he wrought, and the agreeableness of his doctrine to the natural sentiments of our minds, that whatever Jesus Christ was, he came from God. I find him in many places assuming the name, and titles, and worship of God. In discoursing with the Jews, he useth this form of speech, *Before Abraham was*, I AM, on purpose to signify to them, that he was that very Divine Being which was revealed to Moses under that name. And some time after, he tells them that as he was the Son of God, so *he and the Father were one*. That the Jews understood him in this sense, I am sure, because they took up stones at each of these sayings, to stone him as a blasphemer, because he made himself *equal with God*. If these expressions were not to be understood in the sense they took them, he would certainly have undeceived them, and made it known, that he was not God

*See also Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 22, 23, and 24.---Novat. de Trin. c. 22.---Basil. Mag. adv. Eunom. l. 1. and l. 4.---Athan. in Disput. adv. Arium.---Greg. Naz. orat. 16 and 49.---St. Chryst. in loco.---Theoph. in loco.---Greg. Nyss. adv. Eun. p. 8.---Cyril Hie. in Cat. 11.---Aug. de Trin. l. 4. c. 9, et lib. 5. c. 3.---And, in short, Maldonatus on the place says, that all the Catholic writers expounded it of the divine essence.

the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered

" in the sense they understood him; but that he was only a God " by deputation, according to the wild notion of the Socinians. " But he spake the truth, and the Jews understood him right, that " he was eternal God, equal with the Father, the very same God " who was signified by that sacred name I AM. And he hath never " undeceived either them or us to this day; but instead thereof, " hath used many expressions to countenance and encourage this " notion of him; and therefore if I act like a reasonable man, I am " under a necessity either of giving my assent to this, or of utterly " rejecting him as an Impostor.

" Now, had he been an Impostor, God, who shewed himself " always very jealous of his honour, would never have confirmed " this doctrine of his with such repeated testimonies. If we sup- " pose him to be only a messenger come from God, and a mere " man, who spake only by his Spirit and commission, he would " never have used such expressions as must naturally be misunder- " stood, and lead thousands into the gross sin of idolatry, which of " all others is most detestable to God. Moses was never suffered " to enter into the land of Canaan, for a much less suspicious ex- " pression, Num. 20. 10, and in the heat of passion too—*Must we* " *bring water out of the rock?* Which was a vain glorious insinua- " tion, that they wrought that miracle by their own immediate " power, and proper efficacy. This comes much short of these " expressions of our Saviour—*Destroy this temple, and in three* " *days I will raise it again.—I have power to lay down my life, and* " *I have power to take it up.—Before Abraham was* I AM. And, " indeed, that passage concerning Moses seems to have been upon " record by the special providence of God, for this purpose, that it " might be a good argument of conviction to the Jews of the Di- " vinity of the Son, since this inference was very natural and ob- " vious from it, to wit:

" If God was so incensed with Moses for making use of one " expression, which seemed to encroach upon his prerogative; " then how far would he have been from giving testimony of " much more frequent and greater miracles, to a person, who, " by many plainer expressions, assumed to himself the full power " and perfection of the Godhead, if he were not really what he " gave himself out to be?

" For this reason, I say, because I cannot reject him as an Impos- " tor, therefore I believe this proposition, and confess, the blessed " Jesus the Son of God to be eternal God equal with the Father.

" Now thus far I proceed in this mystery upon the stricktest rules " of reason and evidence, and my faith in this proposition is found- " ed upon clear and distinct ideas; for I know clearly whom I

answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy, AND BECAUSE THAT THOU, BEING A MAN, MAKEST

" mean by Jesus Christ, namely, that person who was born of the " virgin Mary, and crucified under Pontius Pilate; I have a clear " and distinct idea of what it is for one thing to be equal to ano- " ther; and I apprehend very well what is signified by the name of " God here, namely, that Divine Being, whose necessary existence " I infer from that clear knowledge I have of his creatures; and of " whose nature, though I have not the least notion as it is in itself, " yet I form the best idea of him I can, by enlarging all the per- " fections that are discernable in the creatures. And I have a clear " and distinct idea of what it is for one person to be the son of ano- " ther. Thus I understand the meaning of the words; nor is there " any thing in them contradictory to my reason. And, lastly, I " have clear and distinct ideas of those miraculous proofs to the " senses of men; and of those completions of prophecies; and the " excellency of that doctrine they confirm; the agreeableness of it " to the common notions of men; and its natural tendency to make " men easy, and pleasant, and useful to one another. All which " raise such an evidence or knowledge in my mind of the divinity " of his mission, who revealed this proposition to me, that I must " do violence to my reason, if I do not give my assent to it. And " thus far it is not so properly and strictly a mystery.

" But when I think of this proposition again, Jesus the Son of " God, is God equal with the Father; I must own at the same " time I give my assent to it, I have no knowledge of that eternal " generation which I form an improper idea of from the procreati- " on of one man from another. Nor have I any notion of this " wonderful union of the human nature with the Divinity. Nor can " I in the least imagine wherein this equality consists. These, and " all other things relating to the manner of it, are wholly out of " the reach of all my capacities, and totally obscured from me. " These are the things which make it a mystery, and in respect of " this part of it, the authority, or veracity of God is the only " ground of my persuasion; and my Christian faith of this article " consists in thus giving my assent to the existence of things which " I have no notion of, when he hath taken care to give me undoubt- " ed testimonies of the revelation's coming from him. And I trust " he will accept of it, because it is no rash inconsiderate assent, but " that I use those powers of knowledge I have, as strictly and im- " partially in this, as I would do in any affair which immediately " concerned my life."

MAKEST THYSELF GOD. *Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are Gods?* [5]

If

[5] A pious writer hath represented our Saviour's argument in the following manner: "The Jewish kings and rulers were types of "Christ; and were named gods, and called the children of the "Most High; as the great antitype was the Son of God, and one "with his Father. They were shadows; he is the substance. "They were called gods; he is really God. So that this is the "force of our Saviour's argument:—What the types were in name "and shadow, that the antitype must be in reality and substance; "for *the scriptures cannot be broken.* But these types were gods in "name and shadow; therefore the Messiah, who is the antitype, "must be God in reality and substance. Thus in the Jewish sacri-"fices there was a shadow of substitution, and they were called "atonements; so in Jesus Christ there was a real substitution, and "a real atonement. And indeed, the Messiah must be in reality "all that which the types were in name and shew; otherwise the "scripture would not be accomplished and verified.

"If any, therefore, should say, that as the Jewish kings were "gods by office, so Christ was only a God by office; as they only "had the shadow of divinity; so he only has the shadow of "divinity:—I answer—Then the scripture is broken: the types "are not accomplished in the antitype. It is all a shadow still. "The substance is not come. And the prophetic prayer, with "which the 82d. psalm concludes is never to be answered:— "*Arise, O God, judge the earth; for thou shalt inherit all* "*nations.* For it is not a God, but a mere creature, that is to have "*the Heathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for* "*his possession,* Ps. 2. 8. And if his divinity is but a shadow, so "is his atonement. The true atonement is not come. The types "are not fulfilled. The scripture is broken. And we are yet in "our sins. For the blood of one mere creature can no more make "a real atonement than the blood of another mere creature. The "blood of a bull or a goat, and the blood of a mere man, are "equally at an infinite remove from any virtue to make a proper "atonement for sin. All that has been done is a mere shadow. "There is no substance in it. And so the scripture is broken, and "the truth of divine revelation in general, overthrown. For if any "one thing, held forth in a type or a prophecy, should fail of ac-"complishment, the truth of that whole revelation, in which that "type or prophecy is contained, would be overthrown. So thus "granting the Old Testament to be divinely inspired, our Saviour's "argument amounts to a strict demonstration.

"The sense the Arians give to the words is this, *I and my Father* "*are one,* that is, I and my Father are engaged in the same design. "And when the Jews, through mistake, thought he meant, that he

If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken: say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the SON *of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that* THE FATHER IS IN ME AND I IN HIM. *Therefore they sought again to take him; but he escaped out of their hands.*[6]

Some persons are pleased to tell us, that in this passage our Lord disclaimed all pretensions to divinity. But it is very evident the Jews, to to whom he spake, thought far otherwise; for they charge him directly with blasphemy, and making himself equal with God. He quotes the Old Testament, and attempts to illustrate his meaning; but it is all so little to their satisfaction, that they were proceeding to seize him, when he escaped out of their *hands.*[7] If he had been a *mere*

" was one with God: he answers, I do not mean I am God by " nature, but only God by office.

" Query 1. What was this answer to the purpose?—Query 2. " Why did not he expressly tell them, that he only meant he was " engaged in the same design with his Father, as all other good " men are? This would have cleared him from the odious character " of a blasphemer, and prevented their taking up stones again to " stone him. And if indeed he was but a man, all must own, it " was his duty to have spoken out, in as plain a manner as Paul and " Barnabas did, when the people of Lystra took them for gods, " and were about to offer sacrifice to them. But to suffer himself " to pass for a blasphemer now, and soon after to be pronounced " worthy of death for blasphemy; and yet never clear up the mat- " ter; but leave his disciples after him, to follow his example, and " call him God, the true God, *God blessed forever*, by whom and " for whom all things were created, when he was as really a mere " creature as you and I, is what can never be accounted for."

Dr. Bellamy on the Divinity of Christ, p. 24.

[6] John 10. 23—39.

[7] St. Cyprian considers this quotation from the Old Testament in the same light. " If righteous persons," says he, " who paid due

mere man, according to his external appearance, he had nothing to do but to tell them so, and all would have been easy. But as he used such expressions as led them to think he pretended to be EQUAL WITH GOD, he either was so in reality, or he dealt very disingenuously with them. He was to blame; they were to be pitied. [s]

192.* There

" obedience to the laws of God, might with any degree of fitness " and decency be entitled Gods; how much more might Christ, " the Son of God, be stiled God in his own person?"

Test. against the Jews, b. 2. sect. 6.

[s] The whole of this piece of sacred history is set in as clear a light as can be desired by Fiddes in the same work we have quoted on former *occasions*. " As our Lord," says he, " was walking in " the temple, the Jews came to circumvent him, asking him if he " was the Messiah. He, knowing their design and malice, did not " think fit to answer them directly, but appeals to his miracles, and " tells them moreover expressly, that God was his Father, and that " *he and his Father were one*. The Jews immediately charge him " with blasphemy, for *making himself God*, and prepare to stone him. " Our blessed Lord, in his own vindication, does not tell them that " he is not God, or that he does not make himself God; a method " which one would think he would have taken, had it been consistent " with truth and justice, in order to take off so severe a charge as " that of blasphemy. But he makes them two answers, which, in- " stead of removing, rather confirmed their suspicion, and provoked " them still more. They are to this effect; as if he had said; If " some of your own Sanhedrim or Judges, who have no more than " a remote and imperfect resemblance of divine Majesty, in respect " of their office, are called Gods in holy scripture; shall one, who " has a proper right and title to that name; one whom the Father " (having had him with him all along) hath sanctified, and *sent into the* " *world*, be charged with blasphemy, for styling himself *the Son of* " *God*; a title which he has a strict and natural right to? Yet if you " will not believe my words, at least *believe the works that I do*; be- " ing manifestly *the works of my Father*; so that you may easily " judge from my doing the same things that the Father doth, and " from the unity of power and operation, that we are both one, and " *the Father in me, and I in him*. The Jews were so enraged at " this; perceiving now, instead of clearing himself of what they " called blasphemy, he had the more strongly asserted his divine " generation, that they again would have laid hold of him to draw " him out of the temple, with an intention to stone him." vol. 1. " p. 414.

192.* There is another very remarkable passage of scripture, where our blessed Saviour vindicates his own pretensions, which contains various intimations of his divine original:—*Jesus answered* the Jews, who were finding fault with him for healing a man on the sabbath day, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.*[9] *Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father,*[1] MAKING HIMSELF EQUAL WITH GOD. *Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them: even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:* THAT ALL MEN SHOULD HONOUR THE SON, EVEN AS THEY HONOUR THE FATHER. HE THAT HONOURETH NOT THE SON, HONOURETH NOT THE FATHER

See also Randolph's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, part 2. p. 43—48, where this piece of sacred history is set in a very just and proper light. Consult too Trapp on the Trinity, p. 124—127.

[9] "If Christ is only a man, how doth the Son accomplish those "things which the Father doth, since a man is not able to do works "like to the heavenly actions of God?"

Novat. cap. 14.

[1] "It is very reasonable to conceive," says Dr. Clarke, "that Je-"sus in this place, by calling God his Father in so absolute and parti-"cular a manner, might intend to hint to his disciples what they "could not then, but were afterwards to understand, namely, that "he was Λογος θεος, that *Word which was in the beginning with* "*God, and was God*, John 1. 1.

Scrip. Doct. p. 86.

WHICH HATH SENT HIM.[2] This is a part of our Lord's vindication of his own conduct, when accused by the Jews of having violated the sabbath, because he had performed a miraculous cure on that day. His vindication, however, was so little to their satisfaction, that they accused him still farther of making himself EQUAL WITH GOD. Our Saviour goes on to explain, but without making the least concession, or giving the smallest intimation of his simple humanity. *He claims God for his* OWN PROPER FATHER—*assumes a* RIGHT OF OPERATING ON THE SABBATH—*a* POWER OF IMITATING GOD IN HIS WORKS OF PROVIDENCE——OF QUICKENING WHOMSOEVER HE WILL, *of those that are dead*—the PRIVILEGE OF JUDGING THE WORLD, and of BEING HONOURED LIKE AS HIS HEAVENLY FATHER IS HONOURED.[3] That these are the pretensions

[2] John 5. 17—23. "Let us here," says Origen, "ask Celsus "concerning those who are honoured by them as Gods, or Dæmons, "or Heroes? How can you shew, that these are honoured by the "appointment of God, and not merely through the ignorance and "folly of men, who err and fall away from him who ought truly to "be honoured?—If Celsus on the other side, shall ask us the like "question concerning Jesus; I shall shew that the honour given to "him, is appointed of God; *that all men should honour the Son, "even as they honour the Father.*" Cont. Cel. lib. 8.

Dr. Fiddes observes upon this passage, that "they are too "strong expressions to come from any person who knew himself to "be no more than a man, or a mere creature; and even in answer "to a charge of blasphemy, for taking too much upon himself "before."

Theolog. Speculat. b. 4. c. 2.

[3] "The title of Son denotes an equality of nature, and we here "find that the Jews understood it in the same sense. They sought "to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said "also that God was his Father—*his own proper Father*—Πατερα "ιδιον ελεγε τον θεον—making himself *equal* with God.—That "the Jews understood him to assume an equality, not of power or "authority only, but of nature, is evident, because their charge is "founded upon his calling God—ιδιον Πατερα—*his own proper Fa-*

pretensions of Jesus is evident from the whole context; and that they are inconsistent with every idea we can intertain of *mere created excellence*, is what I submit to the judgment of every impartial enquirer into the truth as it is in Jesus. He is either, as it seems to me, the TRUE, PROPER, NATURAL SON OF GOD, or it is impossible to vindicate him from the most insolent and consummate imposture. *There is no medium* (I speak it with reverence) *between his being the* REAL AND GENUINE SON OF GOD, *and a most* DARING BLASPHEMER.[4]

" *ther.* But what does our Lord reply to this? Does he tell the " Jews that they misunderstood him? Does he explain what " he meant by calling God his Father? Does he deny that this im- " ported an equality with the Father? Does the Evangelist give us " any intimation that the Jews made a wrong inference from his " words? Something of this kind surely might have been expected, " had our Lord been only a creature. Instead of this, he continues " to make use of the same offensive term; and that in such a man- " ner, as to intimate still more strongly the closest conjunction be- " tween him and his Father—*Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son* " *can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for* " *what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise. For* " *the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself* " *doth.*—But, I suppose, I shall be told, that these words imply a " superiority in the Father. Our Saviour declares he could do no- " thing of himself, and thereby acknowledges that his whole con- " duct was in submission to the will and commands of God the Fa- " ther.—Very true. Our Lord, with regard to his mediatorial " office, acted as the Father's delegate and embassador, and did " nothing but by his commission. And this was very proper to in- " sist on in answer to the Jews, who accused him of blasphemy, " that he had done and said nothing but by authority and commis- " sion from the Father."

Randolph's Vindication, p. 2. p. 38—40.

[4] " It would hardly have been consistent with his sincerity and " probity, his integrity and honesty, as a man, if he had not " been God too, to let the Jews understand his words in such a " wrong sense, and lay such an high charge of blasphemy against " him upon it, and not to say any thing to shew they were mistaken, " and to correct their error, and to vindicate and defend himself: " for otherwise it will look as if he had been willing to let their " mistake pass, though he knew it to be so, and to assume to him-

PART SECOND.

SECTION III.

Christ's MANNER of *working miracles* a PROOF of his divinity.

193. IT ought to be observed, when we are speaking of the pretensions of Jesus, that the *manner* of his working miracles seems corroborative of his divinity. He conducts not himself herein as Moses and the Prophets, as the Apostles and primitive Christians, were wont to do, but rather as the Lord of nature, in whose hand was the life of every living thing. *Son*, says he to the sick of the palsy, *thy sins be forgiven thee*[5] —to the raging winds and seas, *Peace, be still*—to the leperous, *Be clean*—to the crooked, *Be straight*—to the deaf, *Hear*—to the blind, *See*—to the dumb, *Speak*—to the withered hand, *Be stretched out*—to the dead

" self the vanity of being thought to be God, and by his words to " make himself such, though he had never said it, or thought it, " but knew the contrary, which is an intolerable reflection upon the " meek and humble Jesus; and not only upon the truth of his di- " vinity, but even his honesty, as a man." Payne's Sermons on " Christ's Divinity, p. 75.

See too the present Mr. Robert Gray's Discourses on various Subjects, p. 64, where he considers this passage of scripture as a proof of our Lord's essential divinity.

[5] Mar. 2. 5, 7. Dr. Clarke observes upon this, that " it is not " improbable, but our Saviour might mean to give his Disciples " some intimation that he was Λογος θεος that *Word which was in* " *the beginning with God, and was God*, John 1. 1."—And Irenæus makes the following remark upon the same passage:—" Our " Lord," says he, " when he forgave sins, at the same time healed " the man, and plainly declared who himself was: for if none can " forgive sins, and heal men; it is plain that he was the Word of " God, made the son of man, receiving from his Father the power " of forgiving sins, because he was man, and because he was God." Lib. 5. cap. 17.

dead, *Arise*—and to the putrid carcase, *Come forth.* Now, if our blessed Lord was nothing more than a mere man, and acted solely by commission from his Father, in like manner as Moses and the Prophets did, and in no higher a sense, there was an arrogance and presumption in his manner infinitely unbecoming such a character. It is impossible not to call to mind, on reading the wonderful works of our Saviour, the *manner* of the ALMIGHTY when the foundations of the world were laid. *Let there be light—Let there be a firmament—Let the waters be collected—Let the earth bring forth grass—Let the waters abound with fish, and the earth with animals—Let the sun, moon and stars enlighten the heavens.* In all this there is a striking similarity. And in the former instance, as well as in the latter, we may say with truth, what the flatterers of Herod said feignedly and blasphemously, *It is the voice of a God, and not of a man.*[6]

This

[6] Acts 12. 22.—Burnet, of the Charterhouse, has expressed this with great elegance. The learned Reader will consult the original; my plan obliges me to give a translation. "Moreover," says he, "when Christ wrought his miracles, he spake not as the Apostles, "in the name of another; but commandingly and like a God. "Of old God said, *Let there be light, and there was light*: Christ "said, *I will*; *be thou clean*; and the leper was cleansed, Mat. 8. "3.—He said to the paralytic, *Arise, take up thy bed and go to thy "house*; and he went away healed, Mat. 9. 6.—*He said to the sea,* "while the tempest was raging, *Peace, be still, and the wind ceased "and there was a great calm.* It is not the voice of a man; it is "God himself." De Fide et Officiis, cap. 7. p. 120.

"Let us first look at the air and manner," says the learned author of the Origin of Arianism Disclosed, "in which he executes "his greater acts of miraculous might. He speaks to the leper, "*I will, be thou clean.* He says to the man with the withered hand, "*Stretch forth thine hand.* He tells the blind man, *Receive thy "sight.* He says to him who had now been crippled in his limbs for "eight and thirty years; *Take up thy bed and walk.* He calls to "Lazarus, lying in the vault of rock before him, and swathed "round with sepulchral linen, *Lazarus, come forth.* And he finally "takes upon him, to rebuke the most unruly elements of nature, "the winds and the waves; and to address these words to the sea, "when wildly agitated with a storm, *Peace, be still.* These are

This will appear the more remarkable, when it is compared with the *manner* in which Moses and the Prophets wrought their miracles. They were all done, except the one of Moses, which lost him the promised land, with the most profound humility, and direct appeal to the Almighty. This was still more remarkably the case with the Apostles of our Lord. Both Angels and Men have been employed as the agents and instruments of the supreme God; but then they never forgot themselves and their ministerial character so far, as to attempt to work a miracle at their own pleasure, in their own names, and by their own power. None of them ever spake as though they were the Lords of nature. The Apostles, in particular, carefully avoided and disclaimed this every where, and upon all occasions. Thus, in the case of the impotent man, Peter says, *In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.* Acts 3. 6. So says Ananias, *Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus that appeared to thee in the way, has sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight.* Acts 9. 17. St. Peter says again, *Æneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole.* Acts 9. 34. *His name*, says the same Apostle in another place, *through faith in his name, hath made this man strong.* Acts 3. 16. In short: As the miraculous operations of the Old Testament, were wrought by an appeal to the power of God, so several of those of our Lord were effected in the highest stile of self-conscious divinity, and most of those wrought by the hands of the Apostles, were professedly accomplished in the name and by the power of Jesus Christ of Nazareth. Upon the supposition that Messiah was a *mere* man, this seems altogether unaccountable; but upon the principle that he was God and man united for the purposes of human redemption all is plain, natural, and easy.

" all imperial acts of authority. They are obviously in their manner,

PART SECOND.

SECTION IV.

Christ's testimony to his own person and character at the close of his life, and after his resurrection.

THE several declarations, which our Saviour made, when he came towards the last woe-fraught scene of his life, are of great importance in this inquiry into the original dignity of his person. Some very able men have been of opinion, that the professions he made before his judges decisively declare the divinity of his character.[7] I will produce the passages from the four Evangelists, that the reader may be better able to judge of the charge for which our blessed Saviour was condemned to death:—

194. *And the high priest answered and said unto him; I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us, whether thou be* THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD,

" the operations of inherent and essential Deity. The pointed bre-
" vity of the sentences, is the genuine sublimity of power; the easy
" language of a mind, reposing upon its own dignity, and familiar
" with exertions of divinity."

Page 15.

[7] The most complete, yet concise view I recollect to have seen of the doctrine concerning the divinity of Christ, the Sacred Trinity, and the Holy Spirit, is to be met with in the seventh part of the excellent Dr. Doddridge's Course of Lectures. All that can be said upon the subject, with any degree of certainty, may there be seen in a very small compass. No man who wishes to understand his religion, no clergyman especially, should be without this invaluable work. I verily believe it has not its equal in the world. The last edition by Dr. Kippis should be by far the best; but I have had no opportunity of examining whether he hath acted impartially by it, or whether he hath given it a turn to his own sentiments.

GOD. *Jesus saith unto him,* THOU HAST SAID; *nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see* THE SON OF MAN SITTING ON THE RIGHT HAND OF POWER, AND COMING IN THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN. *Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death.*[8] Mat. 26. 63—66.

195. *Again*

[8] "It is not the mere appellation of the Son of God as applied "to Christ by others," says a learned writer, "on which the stress "deserves to be laid, but the appellation, as it was assumed by "himself, and understood by the Jews. They considered his pre- "tension to the title as blasphemy, and at last condemned him to death "for it. But in what did this blasphemy consist? In the more ge- "neral sense of the words it could not be considered as blasphemy; "for the Jews called themselves Sons of God, and God their com- "mon Father: It could not be as a Prophet, for he was considered "by the generality of the Jews, as a great Prophet, and as such he "was entitled to the name of the Son of God in an eminent degree. "It must, therefore, have been in a sense, which had never before "been applied to man, and was compatible only with that *great per-* "*son* so long predicted by their Prophets. That Jesus Christ "meant, under the title of the Son of God, to represent himself as "the Messiah, the Christ, is admitted by all, who call themselves "Christians, as well as by the Jews, who condemned him to the "cross. His blasphemy, therefore, consisted in calling himself the "Messiah. But what was the extent of the blasphemy? The So- "cinians say, that Jesus Christ never professed himself to be more "than man, and that the imputed blasphemy did not imply any pre- "tension to divinity; but merely the assumption of a certain great "office and commission from God, which the Jews considered as an "imposture: and they alledge in favour of this assertion, the com- "mon expectation of the Jews, who looked only for a great tem- "poral deliverer.—In answer to this allegation we may reply, that "the *expectation* of the Jews cannot be made the rule of *our belief.* "Predictions are never properly understood, till they are accom- "plished. Our belief, therefore, of Jesus Christ, is not to be re- "gulated by the Jews expectations of the Messiah, or *their* opini- "ons of Jesus Christ; but by *his* professions of *himself.*

"Now from these professions, in the many passages, where "Christ speaks of God as his Father, in the most marked and ap-

195. *Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou* THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE BLESSED? *And Jesus said,* I AM: *and ye shall see* THE SON OF MAN SITTING ON THE RIGHT HAND OF POWER, AND COMING IN THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN. *Then the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy: What think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death.* Mark 14. 61—64.

196. *And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people,*

 and

" propriate relation, the obvious inference is, that the appellation of " the Son of God, assumed by him, implies the same kind of re- " lation to him, as that of a man to his father; that is, it implies " coessentiality with God, and therefore equality of nature, and " consequently divinity in its full extent. Such, I say, appears to " be the obvious inference: but, thanks to the evangelical histori- " ans, we are not left to a mere presumptive inference: for we have " the express attestation of his living witnesses the Jews, to what " they considered as his meaning: they repeatedly charged him " with blasphemy for making himself *equal with God—one with God* " —and *God:* and at last condemned him to death for his blas- " phemy by virtue of the Levitical law.

" The Jews, indeed, and his enemies, might have exaggerated " the charge against him: But Christ knew, in what sense they " understood the appellation, which he assumed; and by his acqui- " escence admitted the truth of their allegation. If they had mis- " understood his pretensions, he had many opportunities of undeceiv- " ing them, and no doubt would have undeceived them, not to " prevent his death; (for that end he knew that he was destined;) " but, (what in his opinion, to consider him only as the best of all " just men, must have been of much greater consequence,) to prevent " the propagation of an error, which his acquiescence in their charge " could not fail to establish. Yet instead of correcting their opinions " he confirmed the charge by repeating his assertions, and submitting " to the sentence, which the Levitical law passed on him for calling " himself the Son of God. Therefore, if we admit in any degree " the truth of the Christian revelation, and believe that Christ " *came into the world, that he should bear witness unto the truth,* " we must believe him to have been what he professed himself to be, " THE SON OF GOD, in the literal sense of those terms, which his " living witnesses imputed to them, that is, *God—equal with God—* " and *one with God.*"

Burgess's Sermon on the Divinity of Christ, p. 40.

and the chief priests, and the scribes came together, and led him into their council, saying, Art thou THE CHRIST? *Tell us. And he said unto them, If I do tell you, you will not believe. And if I ask you, you will not answer me, nor let me go. Hereafter shall* THE SON OF MAN SIT ON THE RIGHT HAND OF THE POWER OF GOD. *Then said they all, Art thou then* THE SON OF GOD? *And he said unto them,* YE SAY THAT I AM. *And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth.* Luke 22. 66—71.

197. *When the chief priests therefore and officers saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto him, Take ye him, and crucify him; for I find no fault in him. The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die,* BECAUSE HE MADE HIMSELF THE SON OF GOD. John 19. 6, 7.

From a comparison of these four passages of holy scripture, it is manifest, that our Saviour, to the very last scene of his mortal life, professed himself to be THE SON OF GOD.[9] He had done the same upon many

[9] The writings of the Old Testament frequently foretel, that Messiah should be the Son of God. See Ps. 2. 7.—Ps. 89. 26, 27.—Is. 9. 6.—Hos. 11. 1.—Accordingly when our Saviour appeared, Messiah and the Son of God were frequently, though not always, used as convertible terms, as is evident from various passages in the New Testament. See particularly, Mat. 8. 29.—John 1. 49.—John 11. 27.—But then there are several senses in which Messiah is called the Son of God.

1. He is so called because of the miraculous manner of his conception. See Luke 1. 35.

2. He is so called because of his resurrection from the dead. See Acts 13. 32, 33.

3. He is so called because of his dignity and authority. See Heb. 1. 2—5.

4. He is so called because of his office. John 10. 36.

In all these respects our Saviour was the Son of God by way of eminency and excellency above all others, except in the first instance. But then,

many former occasions. When he was but twelve years of

5. Christ is called the Son of God in such a way and manner as never any other was, is, or can be, because of his own divine nature, he being the true, proper, and natural Son of God, begotten by him, ineffably, before all worlds. The New Testament speaks of this peculiarity of his Sonship upon various occasions. Thus:—*God so loved the world, that he gave his* ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, *that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; for God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of* THE ONLY BEGOTTEN SON OF *God.* John 3. 16, 17, 18.——Again:—*God sending his* OWN SON *in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh.* Rom. 8. 3.——Again:—*When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth* HIS SON *made of a woman, made under the law.* Gal. 4. 4.——Again:—*For this purpose* THE SON *of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil.* 1 John 3. 8.——And again:—*In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent* HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON.—1 John 4. 9.—From all these passages, and others that might be produced, it is evident, that Christ was the Son of God in an high and peculiar sense, such as no other Being was, is, or can be. This was the sense of all the great writers of the Christian church from the beginning. Novatian says, "that as our Saviour's being the Son of Man declares his humanity; so his being the Son of God is an undeniable proof of his divinity."——And again:—"Christ is not only a man, because the Son of Man, but is also God, because the Son of God."

De Trinit. cap. 11.

St. Athanasius says, "We believe in one only begotten WORD, born of the Father, without beginning of time, from all eternity, being not a division from the impassible nature, or an emission, but a perfect SON."

Expos. Fid. p. 240.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem saith, "When thou hearest Christ called a Son, do not think him to be an adopted Son, but a natural Son, an only begotten Son, not having any brother; for he is therefore called the only begotten, because there is none other like him, either as to the dignity of his deity, or his birth from his Father."——And again:—"When thou hearest him called a Son, do not understand him so only abusively or improperly, but understand him to be a TRUE SON, a NATURAL SON."

Catech. 11. p. 93, 94.

Pamphilus tells us Origen held that "the Son was begotten of the Father, and that he is of one substance with the Father, but different and distinct from created substance—that the only-begotten God our Saviour alone was generated of the Father,

of age, he reproved his anxious parents, by saying, *How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about* MY FATHER'S *business?* During the whole time of his public ministry likewise he uniformly spake of God as HIS OWN FATHER. And even when the Jews charged him with making himself EQUAL *with God*, by pretending to be *his* SON, he never denied the charge, or retracted his pretensions, though they threatened to stone him to death for blasphemy. And here, in this last and melancholy scene of his life, though he well knew from the former conduct of the Jews towards him, that they would certainly put him to death, if

" and is his Son by nature, not adoption, born of the intellect of " the Father itself.—The only-begotten Son alone is the Son of " the Father by nature."—Origen conceived the Son to be born of the very substance of God. " He is consubstantial, or of the " same identical substance with the Father. He is not a creature, " neither by adoption a Son, but by nature, and generated of the " Father himself." Apol. pro Orig. passim.

To these quotations from the Fathers we may add the excellent advice of the famous Alexander of Alexandria, who was the first opposer of Arius:—" It is true," says he, " that the Son was " begotten; but he that enquires farther into the manner thereof, " is not to be reckoned among the pious, seeing he hearkens not " to that which is written:—Seek not after things which are too " difficult for thee, and search not into those things which are too " high for thee; for if the knowledge of many other things, far " inferior to this, exceed the reach of an human understanding, " how then shall any without madness pretend curiously to search " into the essence of God the Word? of whom the prophetic " Spirit saith, *Who shall declare his generation?*"

Theodoret. Ecc. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 4.

See the subject of the Son's generation discussed at large in the second article of bishop Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, p. 105—144.—If any of my younger brethren among the clergy wish to be informed what books they ſhould read for the information of their minds and the settling of their religious opinions, I cannot do them a greater kindness than by recommending to their notice this most learned, solid, and judicious book. A man that has read it carefully, and *digested it thoroughly*, will run little danger of being injured by the *ſlimsy* theology of the present day. It should seem the University of Oxford entertained the same sentiments of this Work, by their having caused it, together with Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, to be reprinted at their press.

if he still persisted in his high pretensions, he nevertheless boldly declared in the face of his implacable enemies, that he was THE SON OF GOD. This he avowed to the last, and for this he was put to death. Our Saviour, therefore, was either what he pretended to be, *the* TRUE *and* PROPER SON OF GOD,[1] without any figure, or equivocation, or he died bearing witness to a falsehood, and was guilty of his own blood.

Besides all these, we have several other testimonies, to the personal character of our blessed Saviour, delivered by himself, after his resurrection from the dead, some before his ascension into heaven, and others after. Thus, before his ascension:—

198. ALL POWER *is given unto me in* HEAVEN *and in* EARTH.

199. *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the* NAME *of the* FATHER, *and of the* SON, *and of the* HOLY GHOST.

200. *Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world.* Mat. 28. 18—20.

And again when he had been about sixty years in the kingdom of glory:—

201. *I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* BEGINNING *and the* ENDING, *saith the Lord, which* IS, *and which* WAS, *and which* IS TO COME, THE ALMIGHTY. REV. 1. 8.

202. Again:—*I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA. REV. 1. 11.

203. Again:—I *am the* FIRST *and the* LAST. REV. 1. 17.

204. Again:—*I am* HE *which* SEARCHETH THE REINS *and* HEARTS. REV. 2. 23.

205. And again:—*I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* BEGINNING *and the* END, *the* FIRST *and the* LAST. REV. 22. 13.

Now

[1] The observations of Dr. Fiddes in his Theol. Specul. vol. 1. p. 420—422, upon this last scene of our Lord's life, are well worthy of the reader's attention.

Now let any one calmly examine these several declarations of our Saviour, and the manner of his working miracles, without any regard to system, with the simplicity of a little child, and then let him say, whether the person, who hath said and done such things, and in such a manner, must not be more than mere man? whether he did not exist before he was born of the virgin Mary? whether he came not originally from heaven? whether he was not naturally superior to all the angelic creation? and whether he did not, some how or other, though in a way inexplicable by us, partake of divinity with his Father? yea, whether he is not as much the natural Son of his heavenly Father, as a man is the natural son of his earthly parent? and, consequently, whether he is not possessed of all the perfections of the Divine Nature? or lastly, whether, if he were not originally and essentially of a rank superior to men and angels, he was not (horresco referens[a]) one of the most consummate impostors that ever appeared in our world?

PART SECOND.

SECTION V.

Testimonies to the PERSON and CHARACTER of Christ, by his Apostles and Disciples, after his ascension into heaven.

BUT all this will more fully appear, by comparing what the Apostles and Disciples of our Lord said of him, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, after he had with-drawn from our world. And this we will do, as near as may be, in the order of time, that we may preserve the same uniformity of plan, which has been

[a] I am shocked while I speak it.

been observed in tracing his character through the several periods of the world, both before he made his appearance in the flesh, and while he conversed among men. This will complete the scriptural view of his character, be it what it may. And here we must rest. We can proceed no further upon tenable ground. If we candidly investigate what was said of him by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, before he came into the world: if we fairly examine what were his own pretensions, while he was in the world, and what were the opinions of others concerning him, during the same period: if we attend with impartiality to the views of the Apostles, when they were under the highest degree of spiritual illumination that they ever experienced, we shall be in the best possible train for arriving at a competent knowledge of the Redeemer's genuine character.—Farther than this, however, we cannot go. For, after all, the word of God must decide the question.

206.* We will then begin our further enquiry into the opinions of the Apostles and Disciples of our Lord, concerning the dignity of his personal character, with the conduct and declarations of blessed Stephen, the proto-martyr. This illustrious saint affords us an eminent example of invocation to the Lord Jesus; who, in the most solemn of all seasons, commits his departing spirit into the hands of his Redeemer; as his Redeemer, a little before, had committed his departing spirit into the hands of his heavenly Father. *When Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.* Luke 23. 46. So this good man, after calling our blessed Saviour, *the* JUST ONE, Acts 7. 52. and reproving the people for betraying and murdering him, BEING FULL OF THE HOLY GHOST, *looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the*

the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right-hand of God; and said,

207. *Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.*

208.* *Then they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city, and stoned him. And they stoned Stephen, invoking, and saying,* LORD JESUS, RECEIVE MY SPIRIT. *And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice,* LORD, LAY NOT THIS SIN TO THEIR CHARGE! *And when he had said this he fell asleep.* Acts 7. 55—60.

St. Stephen's commission of his spirit into the hands of God, after the example of his great Master, is a proof of the separate existence of the souls of men after death; for if they had no souls, why should they pretend to commit them to the care of the Almighty? And his dying invocation of Jesus Christ, in like manner as the same Jesus Christ, in similar circumstances, had invoked his Father, is a further proof, that he believed him to be possessed of real and proper divinity. We may quibble as long as we please upon this conclusion, from this piece of sacred history, but all the sophistry in the world cannot invalidate the force of it. Jesus is either the real and proper Son of God, and entitled to divine honours, or else St. Stephen, though *full of the Holy Ghost*, died in the act of gross idolatry. [3]

St. Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, after the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, first began the business of preaching the everlasting gospel. Before this, during the life-time of his divine Master, he had repeatedly declared his belief, that Jesus was the Son of God: but now, being more fully illuminated, he throws out various hints, which may be considered as explanatory of that high and mysterious term. This, however,

[3] See Bishop Horsley on this account of dying Stephen, Tracts, p. 208.—As the latter of these prayers to Jesus, after his ascension

however, is done with considerable reserve; because the great work the apostles had then to do, was, to convince the world, in the first place, not so much of the divinity of Jesus Christ, as that he was the promised Messiah and Son of God, whatever might otherwise be the meaning of that illustrious and exalted title. All the other doctrines of the gospel would of course follow in due time and order, as the people's minds were prepared, and rendered capable of receiving them.

These things being premised in general, we may now proceed to observe, that in the very first of Peter's discourses, on the same day they were all illuminated from on high, he is joined by the glorious company of the disciples, in offering up a prayer to Jesus, that he would direct the lot for the choice of a new apostle in the room of Judas. And as he had before declared to Jesus, when present, that he knew all things, so he addresses him now, when absent, by an appellation of the same import:—

209.* THOU, LORD, WHICH KNOWEST THE HEARTS OF ALL MEN, *shew whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place.*[4]

into heaven, was answered in directing the lot for the choice of Matthias, so the former prayer of dying Stephen, was also attended to by the Saviour, in the miraculous conversion of the persecuting Saul, and probably of several others of those, who were concerned in his death, on the day three thousand were converted by the preaching of Peter. Si Stephanus non orasset, ecclesia Paulum non habuisset, says one of the Fathers—If Stephen had not prayed, the church had been destitute of Paul.

[4] Acts 1. 24, 25. See Whitby on the place, where he observes, that Woltzogenius truly notes, they prayed to the Lord Jesus. Consult too Burgh's Scriptural Confutation for an unanswerable defence of this interpretation, p. 81—85.

To these several considerations I add, that the Christian fathers are particularly careful to vindicate the omniscience of our blessed Saviour. Ignatius says, "There is nothing hid from the Lord;

This is a second instance of direct prayer being made to the Lord Jesus after his ascension into heaven.

That this prayer was directed to Christ is probable, because he is stiled LORD, which was his common appellation, and it is his prerogative, as well as his Father's, to *know the hearts of all men*; to *know what was in man*, John 2. 25; to be a *discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart*, Hebrews 4. 12; and *to search the reins and hearts*, Rev. 2. 23; and because his apostles were all of his peculiar appointment; he was, therefore, the proper person to be invoked upon this occasion to direct the choice; and he himself afterwards called St. Paul to be an apostle in a miraculous manner from heaven. For these reasons I think it unquestionably certain, that Jesus Christ is the Lord here invoked.

210. In the second of St. Peter's discourses, which was instrumental in the conversion of three thousand souls, he tells us, such was the character of Jesus, *it was* NOT POSSIBLE *he should be kept in the grave by the power of death.*[5] Does not this imply, not only that he had a nature superior to simple humanity, but that he was Lord of the invisible world, having the keys of death and the grave in his hand?

211.* In the latter part of the same discourse, St. Peter speaks of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in a way which intimates a connection, that no merely

"but our very secret things are nigh unto him. Let us, therefore, "do all things, as having him dwelling in us; that we may be "his temples, and he our God in us." Ep. ad Ep. cap. 15.

Clemens Alexandrinus tells us—"The Son of God never goes "off from his watch-tower: is never parted, never separated, nor "moving from place to place; but is always every where, and "contained no where: all mind, all light, all eye of his Father, be- "holding all things, hearing all things, knowing all things."

A little after:—"Ignorance cannot affect God, him that was "the Father's counsellor before the foundation of the world."

Strom. lib. 7. cap. 2.

[5] Acts 2. 24. See Horsley's Tracts, p. 206.

ly human being can be supposed to have with the Lord of nature: *Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear.* Acts 2. 33.

212. In the next discourse, which he made, he calls Jesus Christ, THE HOLY ONE; and

213. THE JUST; and

214. THE PRINCE, or author, OF LIFE.[6] And, a few years afterwards, when he preached to Cornelius and his friends, this same apostle informs them, that

215. Jesus *Christ is* LORD OF ALL. Acts 10. 36.

After this same blessed messenger of good tidings had published the everlasting gospel in various parts of the world for many years, he wrote two general Epistles to the converts of the dispersion. In the former of these, written about twenty seven years after our Lord's ascension into heaven, he tells us, that

216. *Jesus Christ went and preached by his Spirit in the days of Noah to the disobedient spirits in prison,*[7] *and and that now,*

217. *Being exalted to the right hand of God,* in his human nature, all *the angels, authorities, and powers are made subject unto him.*[8] Whatever is meant by our Saviour's preaching to the spirits in prison, it certainly implies, that he was, in the opinion of St. Peter, living in the days of Noah, and, consequently, that he had some kind of real and sensible existence before he was born of the virgin Mary and became a human being.

As to all the *angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject* to a mere weak, frail, peccable, though

 glorified

[6] Ibid. 3. 14, 15. See Burgh's Sequel, p. 129.
[7] 1 Pet. 3. 19, 20.
[8] Ibid. 3. 22.

glorified man, it is a notion too idle to need a serious refutation.[g] The Sovereign whom all the angels in heaven obey must assuredly be a being whose nature is, at least, equal to their own. To suppose otherwise, would be more ridiculous than to make a monkey or an ape the absolute monarch over all the tribes of animals. There is an impropriety, an absurdity in the very nature of the thing. And nothing but the most absolute and incontroulable evidence should incline us even to make the supposition. A man, a mere man, a weak, frail, peccable mortal, to be placed at the head of creation![h]—to take his seat at the right hand of God!

[g] Dr. Priestley has given us an account of his view of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, and the high character he sustains as the *present* governour and future judge of mankind in his Letters to Dr. Price; and the result seems to be, that as, while on earth, Christ was no more, exclusive of inspiration, than one of the common people and unenlightened men of his time, or as he speaks, p. 172, "the son of Joseph and Mary, possessed of no natural advantages "over his father Joseph, or any other man in a similar situation of "life in Judea:" So *now* in *heaven* he *is* no more than virtuous Christians are to be, nor does he possess any peculiar authority; nor will he hereafter in raising the world from the dead and judging it, exercise any power which the individuals themselves then raised and judged, will not be equally capable of exercising.

See the Appendix to Dr. Price's Sermons, p. 390.

[h] There is a fine passage on this subject in one of Dr. Price's Sermons, which I will take the liberty of transcribing here for the edification of the reader.—"The scriptures tell us," says this writer, "that Christ, after his resurrection became Lord of the dead "and living; that he had all power given him in heaven and earth; "that angels were made subject to him; and that he is hereafter "to raise all the dead, to judge the world, and to finish the scheme "of the divine moral government with respect to this earth, by "conferring eternal happiness on all the virtuous, and punishing the "wicked with everlasting destruction.—Consider whether such an "elevation of a mere man is *credible*, or even *possible*? Can it be "believed that a mere man could be advanced at once so high as "to be above angels, and to be qualified to rule and judge this "world? Does not this contradict all that we see, or can conceive "of the order of God's works? Do not all beings rise gradually, "one acquisition laying the foundation of another and preparing "for higher acquisitions? What would you think were you told,

God!—to be the king of the armies of heaven!—to have Michael, Gabriel, and all the angels, archangels, cherubim and seraphim, that adore and burn before the throne of God, at his feet!—nay, to have the Holy Spirit himself under his dominion and direction, to send or not send as he pleases!—to be the universal judge of the world, to whom all knees shall bow, all tongues confess, and all hearts submit!—to doom myriads of wretched souls to everlasting burnings with the devil and his angels, and award crowns of immortal glory to countless millions of happy spirits!—Is all this the province of a mere man? a weak, frail, peccable mortal? I cannot conceive that a more silly, romantic idea ever entered the pericranium of a deranged soul in Bedlam.[2]

There

" that a child just born, instead of growing like all other human " creatures, had started at once to complete manhood and the go- " vernment of an empire? This is nothing to the fact I am consi- " dering.—The power, in particular, which the scriptures teach us " that Christ possesses of raising to life all who *have* died and all " who *will* die, is equivalent to the power of creating a world. " How inconsistent is it to allow to him one of these powers, and at " the same time to question whether he could have possessed the " other?—to allow that he is to restore and *new*-create this world; " and yet to deny that he might have been God's agent in originally " forming it?"

Page 146—148.

[2] " I must be allowed," says Dr. Price, " to call this an *absurd* " and *incredible* doctrine." Appendix to Sermons, p. 392.

" Let us for a moment," says Mr. Hawker, " pass the bounda- " ries of probability, and, in opposition, to the numberless obstruc- " tions in the way, let it be admitted. Now, then, we reduce in " idea the great Judge of all the earth to the humble standard of " humanity. But even here, again, a new difficulty arises. To " what cause can we reasonably ascribe this wonderful exaltation? " What was there in the life of Jesus, simply considered as a man, " which merited this astonishing accession to the right hand of " power, to be the Judge of quick and dead, and to determine the " everlasting fate of millions? I speak with all possible reverence, " and even with a religious apprehension upon my mind, while pro- " posing questions of this bold nature. But surely, it could never " be merely for preaching a system of moral virtue, or being a " pattern of the most perfect righteousness, much less for dying as " a martyr to his cause, and sealing the testimony of his doctrine

There is nothing in Jacob Bœmen, or Baron Swedenborg, more romantic!

The second Epistle of St. Peter was written upwards of

" with his blood. These are very inadequate causes, wherefore *a* " *name should be given him which is above every name.* Great as " these qualities are in themselves, and surpassing all comparison, " which the highest, and the best of men bear to the person of " Jesus, yet there is no proportion between the merit and the re- " ward, but it is without parallel, in all the dispensations of pro- " vidence that have ever been revealed to the knowledge of man- " kind." Sermons, p. 243, 244.

I add, moreover, a fine passage from another able writer, upon the same subject;—" When I have been contemplating this sub- " ject" (the Socinian hypothesis) " it has always appeared to me " very strange, that such a magnificent apparatus should be insti- " tuted by heaven to usher into the world one who was nothing " more than a *man!* Angels after angels wing their flight to Beth- " lehem, to indicate the birth of a *man!* Gabriel, one of the most " exalted of the heavenly spirits, is dispatched from the throne of " God to announce the birth of a *man!* The Holy Ghost should " come upon her, and the power of the Most High should over- " shadow the virgin, to convey into her uterus nothing but what was " *human!* Another celestial envoy is delegated to Joseph, to bid " him not hesitate in taking Mary to wife, for that which was con- " ceived in her, was, indeed, of the Holy Ghost, but was nothing " more than *man!* A most magnificent heavenly choir, consisting " of a multitude of angels, cheering the midnight hours with re- " peating, *Glory to God in the Highest! Good will towards men!* " deputed to our world, and chanting these rapturous strains to " celebrate the birth of a *man!* Is it not something incongruous " and disparate, that Heaven should display all this splendid scenery, " and lavish all this pomp and pageantry to introduce into our " world a mere ordinary common man, distinguished in no one " natural endowment from any other of the species? But suppos- " ing the Being introduced with all this eclat, to be the same who " was in *the beginning* with God, and had glory with the Father " before the world was, is not the decoration and magnificence, " with which heaven dressed the stage, on which this Divine mes- " senger would shortly appear, highly pertinent and honourable? " and is it not with the greatest propriety, that multitudes of the " heavenly host, on this *great* occasion, the greatest that ever " occurred in the annals of this world, should conjoin with harmo- " nious voices and accordant hearts, in applauding and solemnizing " a condescension and benevolence, illustrious and great beyond all " example!"

Harwood's Socinian Scheme, p. 49—52.

of thirty years after our Saviour left the world, and just before the apostle's own dissolution. In the opening of it he calls his blessed Master,

218. OUR GOD *and* SAVIOUR *Jesus Christ*; [3] tells us, that

219. Heaven is *the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*; [4] that

220. *To deny the* LORD *that* BOUGHT [5] us with his own precious life is A DAMNABLE HERESY;

221. He exhorts believers to *grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*; [6] and then, as he had opened his public ministry with a prayer to the Redeemer for direction in an important affair he then had on hand, so now he closes his life and his ministry together, with ascribing everlasting glory to the same adorable Being:

222. To

[3] 2 Pet. 1. 1. Mr. Jones observes upon this first verse of St. Peter's second Epistle, that the Greek is—"Τȣ Θεου ημων και Σωτηρος "Ιησου Χριστȣ—the very same, as to the order and grammar of "the words, with the last verse of this Epistle—τȣ Κυριȣ ημων "και Σωτηρος Ιησȣ Χριστȣ—which is thus rendered in our "English version—*of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* And so, "without doubt, it should be in the other passage; there being no "possible reason why τȣ Θεȣ ημων, should not signify, *our God*, as "well as τȣ Κυριȣ ημων, *our Lord.* Our translators have preserv-"ed the true rendering in the margin.

"There is another expression, Tit. 2. 13. that ought to be classed "with the foregoing; *Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious* "*appearing* τȣ μεγαλȣ Θεȣ και Σωτηρος ημων Ιησȣ Χριστȣ, "*of our Great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*"

Catholic Doctrine, p. 11.

I observe, moreover, that St. Ignatius has an expression exactly the same with this of the Apostle:—"According to faith and the "love of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour."—Κατα πιστιν και αγαπην Ιησȣ Χριστȣ τȣ Θεȣ και Σωτηρος ημων.

Ad Rom.

[4] 2 Pet. 1. 11.——[5] 2 Pet. 2. 1.——[6] 2 Pet. 3. 18.

222. To our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, says he, be glory both now and forever. Amen.[7]

This is the evidence, that arises to the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, from the discourses and writings of this warm and affectionate apostle. Well might he declare, as he does in one of the same epistles, *We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*[8] He spake what he knew. He had seen with his own eyes the glory of his Lord and Master. He had heard with his own ears the declaration of his heavenly Father, when *there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased.*

We may observe farther, in addition to these evidences from the various declarations of St. Stephen and St. Peter, that the eunuch of Ethiopia, being instructed by Philip the apostle, declared that,

223. He believed *Jesus Christ to be the* Son *of* God.[9] And St. James, another of his friends and companions, stiles him,

224. Lord of glory.[1] The former character is expressive of what the Redeemer is essentially and by nature, the latter of his present exaltation and glorified humanity.

225. St. Jude says:—*There are certain men—turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and* denying *the*

[7] 2 Pet. 3. 18.—Origen has an ascription of glory to Christ like unto this of St. Peter:—"Christ is God," says this great man, "and he who adores him, should adore him in spirit and in truth. "Let us, therefore, pray the Lord, that we may be a building "founded upon a rock, which no storm shall have power to over-"throw, through our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom is glory and do-"minion forever and ever. Amen." Hom. 26. in Luc. cap. 3.

[8] 2 Pet. 1. 16, 17.

[9] Acts 8. 37.

[1] James 2. 1. Lord is here supplied by the translators, how justly we need not enquire.

the ONLY LORD GOD, AND OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.[2] Some would render this passage, *Denying the only Lord God, even our Lord Jesus Christ*, and so make it a proof of his divinity.—Others would have it, *Denying the only Lord God and our Lord, Jesus Christ:—Denying Jesus Christ our only Master, God and Lord:—Denying God the only Sovereign, and our Lord Jesus Christ.* Each of these translations is followed by respectable men. The reader will select that which he judges most agreeable to the original. I would never lay serious stress upon a passage which is so ambiguous, in proof of any important doctrine.

226. *Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to* THE ONLY WISE GOD OUR SAVIOUR, *be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.*[3] This passage appears to me ambiguous, and may be applied either to the Father, or the Son. I am rather inclined, however, to suppose, it was intended by St. Jude as an ascription of praise to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The reader will judge for himself.

[2] Jude 4. Consult Whitby, Hammond and Doddridge on the place. See too Jones on the Trinity, p. 42—44.

[3] Jude 24, 25. See Jones on the Trinity, p. 44, where he applies it to the Son. Dr. Guise also applies it in the same manner, giving his reasons for so doing, which reasons seem to me attended with some degree of probability.

PART SECOND.

SECTION VI.

The divinity of Christ argued from some circumstances in the Acts of the Apostles.

THE history and writings of St. Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, next solicit our attention. The field is large, and this part of our design might be extended to a very considerable length. But as it is intended to give only a compendious, though full view of the scriptural representations of the subject before us, it will be our endeavour to render it as short and compact as is consistent with the nature of our plan. In order to this, we will first make our observations upon such parts of the Acts of the Apostles as are to our purpose, and then proceed to the consideration of various declarations in the immortal epistles of this extraordinary man. And in all this, we shall take for granted, not only that the sacred penmen always mean as they say, but that they always reason conclusively; and that if there be any mistakes, any false premises, any weak reasonings, or any silly conclusions, the whole are to be imputed to us, and not, in the smallest degree, to this infallible writer. If I err in this opinion, it is an error in which I glory. For it seems to me, that that man must not only be greatly wanting in modesty and humility, who sets up his own judgment in opposition to that of the sacred writers, but that he must be possessed of a very culpable degree of pride and self-conceitedneſs. Be this, however, as it may, I will produced a number of passages, and appeal to the common sense of serious Christians for the proper meaning and application of them

them. For though there are several things in the holy scriptures, and especially in the writings of this Apostle, hard to be understood; yet, I think, the difficulties referred to by St. Peter, are not upon the subject now under consideration. To me, as far as the *fact* is concerned, the scriptures are herein attended with no *material* difficulty. I receive their declarations as the oracles of heaven, and have no doubt, but they are strictly true, in the full, unequivocal sense of the text and context. If others think differently, I have no quarrel with them, but leave them to God the judge of all, who will render unto every man according to his deeds. We are all equally accountable for the use we make of our understandings, as for our moral conduct.

There are some circumstances in the history of this Apostle's conversion, which naturally draw one's attention back to the appearances of the Schechinah under the Old Testament dispensation; and no man, I think, can coolly compare them together, without any regard to a preconceived system, who would not conclude them to be, either the very same, or, at least, of the very same nature.

227.* *As Saul journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord?* † *And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?——Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus. And straightway*

† Lord Barrington supposes, that Paul being a learned Jew, knew this light to be the Schechinah; and that it imported the divine presence. He therefore with confidence asked, *Who art thou, Lord?*

straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the SON *of God.*[5]

Whether all the circumstances of this remarkable history, when laid together, amount to a strict and absolute proof of the divinity of Jesus Christ, I pretend not to determine: but I submit it to the judgment of the pious reader, whether the idea before suggested (that this appearance of Jesus Christ to Paul and his companions in such wonderful splendor was the Schechinah of former ages) is founded in truth. It seems to me, to have been the same glorious light, which appeared to Adam, to Abraham, to Moses, and to others, upon various occasions. This has been, at least, the conjecture of learned men.[6] And as it admits not of absolute proof, I mention it merely as a conjecture, which is not altogether destitute of probability.

228.* One other passage in the Acts of the Apostles ought not to be omitted. It is that in the twentieth

[5] Acts 9. 3—6 and 19, 20. See also Acts 22 and 26 chapters, where the Apostle gives two separate accounts of this wonderful transaction, with the addition of some heightening circumstances. The learned Bishop of St. David's speaks of this extraordinary event in the following words:—"Another instance, to which I shall "ever appeal, of an early preaching of our Lord's divinity, is the "story of St. Paul's conversion: in which, as it is twice related by "himself, Jesus is deified in the highest terms.—To me, I confess, "it appears to have been a repetition of the scene at the bush, "heightened in terror and solemnity. Instead of a lambent flame "appearing to a solitary shepherd amid the thickets of the wilder-"ness, the full effulgence of the Schechinah, over-powering the "splendor of the mid-day sun, bursts upon the commissioners of "the Sanhedrim, on the public road to Damascus, within a small "distance of the city. Jesus speaks and is spoken to, as the di-"vinity inhabiting the glorious light. Nothing can exceed the "tone of authority on the one side, the submission and religious "dread upon the other. The recital of this story seems to have "been the usual prelude to the Apostle's public apologies; but it "only proved the means of heightening the resentment of his in-"credulous countrymen." Tracts, p. 211.

[6] See Whitby on Acts 22. 6, where this conjecture is considered at large, and with considerable evidence.

tieth chapter, where, addressing the elders of the church of Ephesus, the learned Apostle says, *Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of* GOD, *which he hath purchased with his* OWN [7] *blood.* [8] The divinity of our

[7] Vide Gnomon Bengelii in loco, where he renders this word *proprium, his own proper blood.*

[8] Verse 28. Dr. Doddridge observes upon this scripture:—— "How very little reason there is to follow the few copies which "read *Lord* instead of *God*, the Rev. Messieurs Enty and Lavington have so fully shewn, in their dispute with Mr. Joseph Hallet "on this text, that I think this passage must be allowed as an incontestable proof, that the blood of Christ is here called the "blood of God; as being the blood of that man, who is also *God "with us, God manifested in the flesh.* And I cannot but apprehend, "that it was by the special direction of the Holy Spirit, that so "remarkable an expression was used."

See also Whitby on the place, and Clarke's Scripture Doctrine, p. 74. Mr. Gilpin in his late Exposition says, "This very remarkable expression I think cannot easily be evaded by those, "who deny the divinity of Christ."

I add St. Ignatius has two expressions similar to this of St. Paul. The first is in his epistle to the Romans, sect. 6.—"Suffer me to "imitate the passion of my God." The second is in the first sect. of his epistle to the Ephesians:—"Encouraging yourselves by the "blood of God." Expressions like these would not have been used by the pious Martyr, one should suppose, unless he had conceived himself authorized so to do by scriptural precident. Besides, *the church of* GOD, is a common expression in the New Testament, but *the church of the* LORD is never once used.

I cannot help noticing here a liberty that is taken by the learned Mr. Wakefield with this passage in his late translation of the New Testament. He has rendered it—"Take care to tend the church "of God, which he gained for himself by his own son." The reader will observe this is making scripture, and not translating it. I am not unmindful of the reasons advanced in the note upon this verse. They appear to me, however, by no means satisfactory. We must ever insist, that in all passages of scripture, which contain controverted doctrines, the translator is not at liberty to deviate from the original, to give countenance to his own preconceived hypothesis. He ought to keep as near to the original as the idioms of the two languages admit, and give his readers the liberty of interpreting for themselves; or else he is propagating his own private sentiments only, rather than the truths contained in the sacred writ-

our blessed Saviour, and the atonement which he made for sin, seem to be clearly and strongly intimated in this one verse. And when it is illustrated and explained by other more conspicuous passages, of which great numbers are to be met with in the word of God, we need not hesitate in saying, it is one of the most important texts in the bible.

PART SECOND.

SECTION VII.

The INVOCATION of Christ, a proof of his divinity.

THERE are two or three other circumstances incidentally mentioned in the history of St. Paul's conversion,

ings. The translator, indeed, may be permitted, I conceive, to add what illustrations and explanations to his version he pleases; but no liberties whatever should be taken with the text. Versions of this free and liberal nature are admissible only as exercises of literary skill; proper to be consulted on critical points. As rules of faith they can never be submitted to by any person of the smallest discernment. In all such cases we want to know what is the will of God, and not, what are the opinions of men. On this principle, the translations of Messrs Harwood, Gilpin, and Wakefield, are equally to be rejected. They are all ingenious, but all conducted in such a manner as to leave too much room for the propagation of their own peculiar sentiments, let those sentiments be what they may. And accordingly the first and the last of these learned gentlemen have not failed to inculcate their respective private opinions, one the doctrines of Arius and the other those of Socinus. Such a conduct, I think, cannot be considered as perfectly ingenuous. We ought to be thankful for the labours of learned men, but yet so as to call no man master.—See too Acts 10. 36, where Mr. Wakefield has taken a similar liberty with the sacred text.

The learned reader will consult Mills in loco for the various readings on this passage, and Gnomon Bengelii. See too Grotius and Beza.

conversion, which it is proper to notice before we take leave of the Acts of the Apostles, and which amount to a very considerable proof of the divinity of our blessed Lord and Saviour. For the sacred historian informs us, that it was customary, in the days of the apostles, for all the disciples to invoke Jesus Christ. If then, according to every law human and divine, no being is entitled to religious homage and adoration but the Deity; and if Jesus Christ was constantly invoked in the days of the apostles; it will follow, either that he is possessed of divinity, real and proper divinity, in common with his eternal Father, or else that all the apostles and first Christians robbed God of his incommunicable honour, and were guilty of a very dangerous species of idolatry.

But, because the argument for the divinity of Christ, taken from the worship that appears to have been paid him by the first Christians, amounts to what I would call a theological demonstration, it will be necessary to depart a little from our chronological plan, and to produce all the most material passages to this purpose in one view, and then leave the serious reader to form what judgment of it he may think it deserves.

First then, let us see whether the New Testament affords us any particular precepts concerning prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ. And the following will all or most of them be satisfactory, I believe, to every impartial man.

229.* *Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.* Mat. 7. 21. These are the words of our Saviour; and do they not seem to imply, that it would be the practice of his followers to address him with religious worship, and solemn invocation?

230.* *Jesus came and spake unto his disciples, saying, All power*

power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the NAME *of the* FATHER, *and of the* SON, *and of the* HOLY GHOST.[9] Here is a divine command to dedicate the whole Christian world to the service of the three persons of the Divine Nature, and, if so, to the service of the *Son* as well as the other *two* divine persons. But this will appear more clear and intelligible from the scriptures which follow.

231.* *For the* FATHER *judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the* SON; *that all men should* HONOUR THE SON, *even* AS THEY HONOUR THE FATHER. *He that* HONOURETH NOT THE SON, HONOURETH NOT THE FATHER WHICH SENT HIM.[1]

232.* *If ye shall ask any thing in* MY *name, I will do it.*[2]

233.* *Where two or three are gathered together in* MY NAME, *there am I in the midst of them.*[3]

234.* On

[9] Mat. 28. 18, 19.

[1] John 5. 22, 23. See Whitby on this passage. Origen, speaking upon 1 Cor. 1. 2. "*With all that call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,* declares him to be God, whose name was called upon. And if to call upon the name of the Lord, and to adore God, be one and the self-same thing; then as Christ is called upon, so is he to be adored. And as we offer to God the Father, first of all prayers, so must we also to the Lord Jesus Christ; and as we offer supplications to the Father, so do we also to the Son; and as we offer thanksgivings to God, so do we offer thanksgivings to our Saviour. For the holy scripture teaches us, that the same honour is to be given to both, that is, to God the Father and the Son, when it says, *that they may honour the Son, as they honour the Father.*" Orig. Com. in Rom. 10. lib. 8. p. 478.

Dr. Clarke paraphrases the passage, that "It is the will of God the Father that the Son should be honoured with the same faith and obedience which he requires to be paid to himself."

Grotius remarks on it, "That the power of the Son being known, men might worship and reverence him—Christ secretly shews how closely he is united to the Father; for God does not give his honour to any separate from himself."

[2] John 14. 14.——[3] Mat. 18. 20.

234.* On the strength of these assurances St. John says, *And this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to* HIS *will,* HE *heareth us. And if we know that* HE *hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions, that we desired of* HIM.[4]

235.* Again:—*Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,* CALLING ON THE NAME OF THE LORD. Acts 22. 16.

St. Chrysostom observes upon these words, that by them Ananias "shews that Christ "was God, because it is not lawful to invoke "any besides God." See Whitby on the place.

Socinus was a strenuous advocate for the invocation of Christ. He says, that "to deny "invocation to him, is not a simple error, or "a mere mistake, but a most filthy and pernicious error; an error that leads to Judaism, "and is in effect the denying of Christ;—that it "tends to Epicurism and Atheism."

Smalcius, another Socinian, says, "that they "are no Christians who refuse giving divine "worship to Christ." Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 150.

According to the same elder Socinian writers, Christ, after his resurrection, reigned over all nature, and became the object of religious worship.

[4] 1 John 5. 14, 15. "Nothing can shew," says an able writer, "more clearly and expressly than these passages, that Christ is "the proper object of our prayers, and that he was so considered "by St. John. They serve too as a collateral proof of our Savi-"our's declaration of his divinity. For nothing less than God can "be the proper object of our adorations; therefore, when Christ "assures us, that *he* will be present to all our supplications, and "that *he* will perform our petitions, he encourages and directs us "to address our prayers to him, as well as to the Father; and "therefore, declares himself God, as unequivocally as by any "appellation the most expressive of divinity."

Burgess's Sermon on the Divinity of Christ, p. 41.

ship. "Christ is placed at the right hand of "God in heaven, and is adored even by the "angels."

"He hath received all power in heaven and "in earth; and all things, God alone excepted, "are put under his feet." [5]

236.* *That at the* NAME OF JESUS EVERY KNEE SHOULD BOW, [6] of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that *every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* [7]

237.* And again:—*When he bringeth in the First-begotten into the world he saith,* AND LET ALL THE ANGELS OF GOD WORSHIP HIM. [8]

Now, these five passages *seem*, at least, to enjoin the worship of Jesus Christ, not only upon all human beings, who expect salvation from him, [9] but even upon all

[5] Cata. Ecclesi. Polonicarum, sect. 4. See also Price's Sermons, p. 150.

"The foreign Socinians deny any to be Christians who refuse "divine adoration and invocation to Christ. Hence they have ex- "cluded all our English Unitarians, as the Socinians here call them- "selves, from being Christians, who deny this to Christ."

See Leslie's Short and Easy Method with the Jews, and the Racov. cat. sect. 6. c. 1.

[6] Minutius Felix, when speaking of the worshipping of Jesus Christ and his cross, whom the Heathen denominated a criminal, says, "You strangely err from the way of truth, when you ima- "gine, either that a criminal can deserve to be taken for a Deity, "or that a mere man can possibly be a God."

Octavius. Sect. 29.

[7] Phil. 2. 10, 11.——[8] Heb. 1. 6.

[9] We have the same kind of commands for the worship of Jesus Christ in some of the writers who immediately followed the Apostles. Ignatius says to the church of Rome—"Pray to Christ for "me, that by the beasts I may be found a sacrifice to God." And to the church of Smyrna he has this declaration—"If Jesus "Christ shall make me worthy by your prayer."—The justly celebrated Origen has spoken pretty much at large upon the worship of our blessed Saviour, and vindicated it from the cavils of Celsus. "Therefore," says he, "we worship the Father of truth, and "the Son, who is the truth, two things in personal subsistence, but

all the heavenly host of angels and archangels. But, lest we should by any means mistake their meaning, and suppose they command us to worship the Saviour of mankind, when they really do not, let us further enquire, from the practice of the apostles and first Christians themselves, how they understood them. If they have left us any clear and satisfactory evidence of their own conduct respecting the worship of Jesus Christ, this must be final and conclusive. We can go no farther. We must either submit our judgments and practice to their decisions, or form a religion for ourselves, and remain in a state of infidelity.

238.* First then, dying Stephen prayed to the Lord Jesus Christ—LORD JESUS, RECEIVE MY SPIRIT!

239.* LORD, LAY NOT THIS SIN TO THEIR CHARGE![1]

240.* St. Paul prayed to the Lord Jesus Christ three times upon one occasion:—*Lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me. For this thing* I BESOUGHT THE LORD THRICE, *that it might depart from me. And he said unto me,* MY

 grace

" one in agreement, and consent, and identity of will: so that who-
" ever sees the Son, who is the brightness of the glory of God,
" and the express image of his person, sees God in him, as being
" the true image of God. Now Celsus imagines, that because to-
" gether with God we worship his Son, it follows upon our own
" principles, &c.—We worship one God, and his only Son, and
" Word, and Image, with supplications and prayers to the utmost
" of our power, offering our prayers to God over all by his only-
" begotten Son; to whom we first present them, beseeching him,
" who is the propitiation for our sins, as our High Priest, to offer
" our prayers, and sacrifices, and intercessions to God the Lord of
" all things. Therefore our faith relies only upon God, by his Son,
" who confirms it in us.—We worship the Father whilst we admire
" and adore the Son, who is his Word, and Wisdom, and Truth,
" and Righteousness.

See Bingham's Antiquities, book 13. ch. 2. p. 47.

[1] Acts 7. 59, 60. Bishop Burnet on the Articles, p. 48. justly observes, that, " Stephen here *worships Christ*, in the very same

grace is sufficient for thee; for MY *strength is made perfect in weakness.*[2]

241.* *And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I* PRAYED *in the temple, I was in a trance; and saw* HIM *saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy testimony concerning* ME. *And I said,* LORD, *they know that I imprisoned, and beat in every synagogue them that believed on* THEE. *And when the blood of* THY *martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. And* HE *said unto me, Depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles.*

Here is an undoubted example of direct prayer to the Lord Jesus, after he had left our world, and had been in glory for a considerable time.

242.* *He that in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost* SERVETH CHRIST *is acceptable to God, and approved of men.* Rom. 14. 17, 18. Does not this expression imply religious adoration to Christ?

243.* *Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart,* AS UNTO CHRIST: *not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but as the* SERVANTS OF

" manner in which Christ had but a little while before *worshipped* " *his Father* on the cross." Doddridge on the place.—The Bishop adds, " From this it is evident, that if Christ was not the true " God, and equal to the Father, then this protomartyr died in two " acts that seem not only idolatrous, but also blasphemous; since " he worshipped Christ in the same acts in which Christ had wor- " shipped his Father."

And Dr. Jortin observes upon this passage, that Schlictingius, and other Socinians, allow that this is a prayer dedicated to Jesus Christ. See his Sermons vol. 4. p. 218.

[2] 2 Cor. 12. 7, 8, 9. See Clarke's Scripture Doctrine on this passage, where he thinks it is applied to Christ.

OF CHRIST, *doing service,* AS TO THE LORD, *and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of* THE LORD, *whether he be bond or free.* Ep. 6. 5—8. In a similar passage in the epistle to the Colossians he adds, *For ye serve the* LORD CHRIST. Col. 3. 24. All that I mean to infer from these two scriptures, is, that Christ is the Lord of the consciences of men, and entitled to the religious homage of his servants.

244.* I THANK CHRIST JESUS OUR LORD *who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry.* 1 Tim. 1. 12. This seems plainly to be a form of thanksgiving to our blessed Saviour.

245.* *Now* OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST HIMSELF, *and God even our Father, who hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.* 2 Thes. 2. 16, 17. If the latter is a prayer to God the Father, the former is a prayer to our Lord Jesus Christ.

The writings of this Apostle do indeed abound with prayers to Jesus Christ as well as the Father:—

246.* *Grace to you and peace from*—THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.[3]

247.* *The grace of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST *be with you. Amen.*[4]

248.* *The grace of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST *be with you all. Amen.*[5]

In short; this Apostle, in the course of his fourteen Epistles, repeats these, or such like prayers to Jesus Christ upwards of twenty times. Three times also he plainly calls Christ to witness the truth of what he said,

[3] Rom. 1. 7.——[4] Rom. 16. 20.——[5] Rom. 16. 24.

which surely he would not have done, unless he had believed him to be omniscient, and so a proper object of prayer. Several times, moreover, he offers up prayers and praises to the Lord, in a way which leaves it doubtful whether he meant the Father, or the Son: Yet once, at least, he seems to have ascribed glory to the Son:

249.* THE LORD *shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto* HIS *heavenly kingdom:* TO WHOM BE GLORY FOR EVER AND EVER. *Amen.* 2 Tim. 4. 18.

250.* St. Peter opens his ministry with prayer, and closes it with praise, to Jesus Christ:—THOU LORD,[6] said he on the former occasion, WHICH KNOWEST THE HEARTS OF ALL MEN, *shew whether of these two thou hast chosen.*[7]

251.* And on the latter, *Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of* OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST: TO WHOM BE GLORY BOTH NOW AND FOREVER. *Amen.*[8]

252.* St. John also has some ascriptions of praise to the Redeemer similar to several of those which are gone before:—*Grace be with you, mercy and peace from* THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF THE FATHER.[9]

253.* Again:—*Grace be unto you and peace—from* JESUS CHRIST, *who is the faithful witness.*[1]

254.* Again:—*Come,* LORD JESUS.[2]

255.* Again:—*The grace of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST *be with you all. Amen.*[3]

And

[6] Several of these passages I have introduced on a former occasion, and may do the same again, but as every introduction is with a view somewhat different, I trust the reader will pardon the repetition.

[7] Acts 1. 24, 25. [8] 2 Pet. 3. 18. [9] 2 John 3.
[1] Rev. 1. 5. [2] Rev. 22. 20. [3] Rev. 22, 21.

256.* And again :—*Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his* OWN BLOOD, *and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father,* TO HIM BE GLORY *and* DOMINION *forever and ever. Amen.* [4]

After the religious homage which these several addresses present to the Lord Jesus Christ, it may be observed, that, all the apostles worshipped the Son of God at one and the same time; not, to be sure, as the Father himself, but as the Son of the Father:

257.* *And Jesus led the apostles out as far as Bethany, and he lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.— And* THEY WORSHIPPED HIM, *and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.* [5]

But it is by no means necessary that we should prove the worship of our blessed Saviour to have been the practice of the apostles by an induction of particulars; for it is as clear as any thing well can be, that this was the common practice of all Christians; and the very badge of their belonging to Christ. The following scriptures will justify these assertions :—

258.* *To bind all that* CALL *on* THY NAME. [6]
259.* *Destroyed them* WHO CALLED ON THIS NAME. [7]
260.* *Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace,* WITH THEM

[4] Rev. 1. 5, 6.
[5] Luke 24. 50—52. "We read of many persons, who, when Christ was upon earth, falling down upon their faces, and worshipping him, were never checked or reproved for so doing, as John was, when he offered to worship the angel, and Cornelius, when he made the same offer to St. Peter."
Horne's sixteen sermons, p. 176.
[6] Acts 9. 14.——[7] Acts 9. 21.

THEM THAT CALL ON THE LORD *out of a pure heart.*[8]

261.* *The* SAME LORD OVER ALL *is rich unto all that* CALL *upon him. For whosoever shall* CALL *on the name of the Lord*[9] *shall be saved. How then shall*

[8] 2 Tim. 2. 22. "Some critics tell us that the phrase επικαλημενοι το ονομα Χριστε, *calling upon the name of Christ*, is to "be taken passively, as denoting those who were *named by the name "of Christ*, or who were called Christians. But this cannot be. "The name, Christian, was not known in the world, till sometime "after St. Paul's conversion, when, as St. Luke expressly informs "us, *the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch*; whereas, "before that time, they were distinguished by the title of επικα-"λημενοι το ονομα Χριστε, *those who called on the name of Christ*. "Besides that επικαλημενοι, when followed by an accusative case, "always, signifies to *invoke*, or *worship*, except only where it sig-"nifies to appeal to. Thus, *The same Lord is rich to all who call "upon him—for whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall "be saved.*—Saul is bidden to *wash away his sins, calling on the "name of the Lord.*—And Origen, who must have understood the "import and force of a Greek participle, at least as well as any "modern critic, commenting on one of the above cited passages, "says, The Apostle in these words, declares *him* to be God, "whose name was called upon." Com. in Rom. 10. lib. 8. "The argument, therefore, deduced from this expression, we may "venture to say, stands good; nor can it admit of any farther "reply, or evasion."

Horne's Sixteen Sermons, p. 172, 173.

[9] Porphyry, an infidel and an enemy of Christ and of all Christians, who lived in the third century, acknowledges, that "after "Christ was worshipped, no body experienced any public benefit "from the Gods." Euseb. Præp. lib. 5. cap. 3.

"We find Christ worshipped as Lord, throughout the most dis-"tant countries of the world." Grotius de Verit. lib. 2. sect. 2.

"Tacitus and others attest, that very many were punished, *be-"cause they professed the worship of Christ.*" Ibid. lib. 2. sect. 3.

The same very learned man observes still farther, that "there "were always very many amongst the worshippers of Christ, who "were men of good judgment, and of no small learning." Ibid. sect. 4.

"If Christ is only a man," says Novatian, "how is he every "where present to those who call upon him, since this is not "the nature of man but of God, that he can be present in "every place.—If Christ is only a man, why does man in-

shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? [1]

This scripture, as Dr. Whitby well remarks upon it, presents us with a double argument in favour of our Lord's divinity. First, it applies to *him*, what by the prophet Joel is spoken of Jehovah; secondly, it affirms him to be the object of religious adoration.

262.* *Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints,* WITH ALL THAT IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD, BOTH THEIRS AND OURS. [2]

Nor is the worship of Jesus Christ peculiar to the church militant: [3] for even the church triumphant

K k

"voke him in prayer as mediator, since the invocation of a "man must be considered as ineffectual to the accomplishing "deliverance and salvation? If Christ is nothing more than a "mere man; why is our hope put in him, seeing cursed is the hope "that is placed in man?" De Trinit. cap. 14.

The present Jew "reads how his ancestors saw him, (Jesus "Christ) *adored* by the Christians, in the *first* century; and he "proves it—from the Talmud, wherein are divers relations of "R. Eliezer, the great friend of R. Akiba, who lived in the end "of the *first* century, and the *beginning* of the *second* century, con-"cerning the gospels, and the *public worship* rendered to Jesus "Christ by the Christians."

Allix's Judgment, p. 432.

[1] Rom. 10. 12—14.

[2] 1 Cor. 1. 2.—Quæ invocatio Christi? Tert. ad Uxorem, lib. 2. cap. 6.

[3] The same practice of praying to Jesus Christ was continued by the immediate followers of the Apostles, and it appears from various evidence to have been the common, well known practice among them. For even Pliny, the Roman, was no stranger to it, since he tells the Emperor Trajan, that it was the custom of the Christians "to sing an hymn to Christ as God" every morning.—Polycarp, in the introduction to his Epistle to the Philippians, prays that mercy and peace may be "multiplied to them from Almighty God, and "from our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."—Ignatius to the Magnesians wishes them "health from God the Father, and our "Lord Jesus Christ."—In his Epistle to the Romans he says,

umphant is everlastingly exercised in the same blessed employ :—

263.* *And*

" Health in our Lord Jesus Christ, our God."—In that to the church of Smyrna, " Health in the immaculate Spirit, and the " Word of God."—Again :—" I glorify Jesus Christ our God, " who hath given unto you this wisdom." Ibid.—The church of Smyrna in her circular Letter to all Christians, prays, that " mercy, " peace, and love may be multiplied to them from God the Father, " and our Lord Jesus Christ." And that we may not take these salutations for mere good wishes without any thing in them of the proper nature of prayer, the same church in the same Epistle saith, " They could not leave Christ and worship any other." Moreover, Justin Martyr speaks still more clearly, if possible, than these : " God," says he, " and his only-begotten Son, together " with the Spirit, we worship and adore." And again :—" Next " after the unbegotten and ineffable God, we adore and love him " who is the Word of God ; because that for our sakes he became " man, and was made partaker of our sufferings, that he might " heal us."

And again :—" We know Jesus Christ to be the Son of the " true God, and therefore hold him to be the second in order, and " the prophetic Spirit the third, and that we have good reason for " worshipping in this subordination, I shall shew hereafter."* Again :—" The leaders of these sects have each, in their differ- " ent ways, taught their followers to blaspheme the Maker of the " universe, and him, who by his prophets he had foretold should " come, Christ, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob : with " whom we hold no communion, knowing them to be dishonourers " of God and religion, and despisers of the laws : who, acknow- " ledging Jesus in namely only, refuse to pay him divine worship." Dial. cum Tryp. ed. Thirlb. p. 207.

Again :—" The scriptures expressly declare, that Christ was to " suffer, and is to be worshipped, and is God." Ibid.

Irenæus saith, that " every knee should bow to Christ Jesus, our " Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, according to the good " pleasure of the invisible Father." Lib. 1. cap. 2.

Origen again is very express to the same purpose, and even gives us several of his own prayers to the Son of God :—" We must " pray," says he, " to the Lord Jesus and the Holy Spirit, that " he would take away that mist and darkness, which is contracted " by the filth of our sins, and dims the sight of our souls."—And again :—" I must pray to the Lord Jesus, that when I seek, he " would grant me to find, and open to me when I knock."—Again : —" Let us pray from our hearts to the Word of God, who is the

* Justin Martyr's two Apologies, passim.

263.* *And when Jesus had taken the book, the four beasts*

 and

" Only-begotten of the Father, that reveals him to whom he will, " that he would vouchsafe to reveal these things unto us."—And again in one of his Homilies he addresses himself to the Saviour in these words :—" O Lord Jesus, grant that I may be found worthy " to have some monument of me in thy tabernacle. I could wish " to offer gold, or silver, or precious stones, with the princes of the " people : but because these things are above me, let me at least " be thought worthy to have goats hair in the tabernacle of God, " only that I may not in all things be found empty and unfruitful." Bingham's Antiquities, b. 13. c. 2. p. 52.

It may be observed too, that Origen has more than one hundred homilies which conclude with doxologies to the Son or the Holy Ghost.

I add farther, that this learned man has spoken expressly upon this very text of scripture and put its genuine meaning past all doubt :—" The Jews," says he, " have not believed in Christ, and " therefore do not call upon him whom they have not believed, " Rom. 10. 14. But in the beginning of the epistle which he " (Paul) wrote to the Corinthians, where he says, *With all who, " in every place, call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both " theirs and ours*, he pronounces Jesus Christ, whose name is there " called upon, to be God. If therefore Enos, Gen. 4. 26, and Moſes, " and Aaron, and Samuel, called upon the Lord, and he heard them " —Ps. 99. 6.—without question they called upon the name of " Christ Jesus. And if to call upon the name of the Lord, and to " adore God, be one and the ſame thing, like as Christ is called " upon, Christ also is to be adored ; and as we first of all addreſs " our prayers to God the Father, so likewise to the Lord Jesus " Christ; and as we prefer our petitions to the Father, so likewise " we prefer our petitions to the Son ; and as we render our thanks- " giving to God, so we likewise render thanksgiving to our Saviour : " for the holy scripture teaches that one honour shall be ascribed " to both, that is, to God the Father and Son, when it says, that " *all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.* John " 5. 23. In Epist. ad Rom. lib. 8.

Tertullian, a little before the age of Origen, assures us the invocation and worship of Christ was the practice of all the Christian world. " The kingdom and the name of Christ," says he, " are " extended without limits ; he is every where believed in ; he is " worshipped in all nations ; he reigns every where ; he is every " where adored ; he is in all places equally offered to the accept- " ance of all ; he is to all a king ; to all a judge ; to all a God and " Lord." Adv. Judæos, cap. 7.

St. Cyprian frequently speaks of the same practice :—" We " offer up unceasing thanks to God the Father Almighty, and to

and the four and twenty elders FELL DOWN BEFORE THE LAMB, *having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints: and they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood—and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand; saying with a loud voice,* WORTHY IS THE LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN, TO RECEIVE POWER, AND RICHES, AND WISDOM, AND STRENGTH AND HONOUR, AND GLORY, AND BLESSING. *And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne,* AND UNTO THE LAMB FOREVER AND EVER.[4]

264.* And again:—*Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne,* AND UNTO THE LAMB.[5]

Such is the evidence contained in holy scripture for the religious adoration of our blessed Lord and Saviour. How

" his Christ, our Lord, God, and Saviour, for his divine protection " of the church." Epis. 51.

Again:—" We shall not cease to give thanks to God the Fa- " ther, and to Christ his Son our Lord." Epis. 61.

Again:—" God the Father," says he, " commanded that his " Son should be worshipped: and the apostle Paul, mindful of " the divine command, says accordingly; *God hath exalted him, and " hath given him a name which is above every name; that at the " name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and " things in earth, and things under the earth.* And in the Revela- " tion, when John would have worshipped the Angel, he forbad " him, saying; *See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant, and " of thy brethren; worship the Lord Jesus.*"

De Bono Patientiæ.

[4] Rev. 5. 8—13.——[5] Rev. 7. 10.

How it may affect the mind of other readers I cannot say. To me it appears to contain no less than a theological demonstration, as we observed before, that Jesus is entitled to divine honours. And we are told Socinus himself was so affected with it, that though he believed the Son of God to be no more than a mere man, he could scarce consider them as Christians who with-held adoration from him. He should have gone two or three steps farther, and concluded, that if Jesus Christ is entitled to divine honours, then he is possessed of a divine nature: and if he is possessed of a divine nature, then he must be ineffably one with his heavenly Father; seeing both reason and scripture declare, there is but one living and true God. This seems to follow from what the Apostle says, Gal. 4. 8. For to worship any being as God, that is not BY NATURE GOD, is idolatry. Yea, *all* religious worship is strictly appropriated to God only: *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him* ONLY *shalt thou serve.* Mat. 4. 10. Since then the Lord Jesus has been, and is to be adored, upon the highest authority, we thence infer, upon the same authority, that he is, though in a manner inconceivable by us, of the same nature and essence with his heavenly Father. [6]

[6] I could wish the reader would consult what Bishop Burnet has said upon the worship of Christ in his exposition of the second of the thirty nine articles of the church of England. It appears to me extremely satisfactory.

PART SECOND.

SECTION VIII.

The divinity of Christ argued from various passages in the writings of St. Paul.

IT is now time to proceed to the consideration of such other passages of the writings of St. Paul, as have not yet come under our notice. And as all the epistles of this wonderful man were written within the compass of the last ten or twelve years of his life, it will not be necessary to attend scrupulously to the order of time in which they were composed; we will therefore produce them in the order which may be thought most convenient, and make such observations as naturally arise in the mind upon the perusal of them. Not that we undertake to press into this service every text that might be alledged, but only such as are most material and prominent. For there is a certain dignity of stile, with numberless inimitable little touches in the compositions of all the sacred writers, especially in the works of David, Isaiah, St. John, and St. Paul, which every competent reader will easily feel, but which the most competent cannot so easily explain. In all their writings and discourses they proceed upon this general principle, that Jesus was the Son of God, as well as the Son of man; and though they were not able to illustrate the full meaning of that mixed character, which he sustained solely for the salvation of the world, yet the conviction naturally affected all their language with a certain peculiarity of phrase, suitable to such high and exalted conceptions. The pious and learned Christian sees and feels these fine traits of sentiment, while the common reader is attentive only to the more obvious declarations,

declarations, which force themselves upon his attention, as he passes along. It is to these, therefore, we shall confine our present observations, leaving the reader to reject or admit them as he judges expedient. Nothing but truth can stand long, and no man ought to wish for the establishment of error. Whatever, therefore, in any of these strictures is not agreeable to the genuine meaning and intention of God in his word, I most cordially disavow, even though it should extend to the subversion of my whole system.—But to proceed.

The passages in the writings of this Apostle, which most forcibly affect the mind, on the subject of Christ's higher nature, may be these that follow:

265. In the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, there is a remarkable passage relating to the point under consideration:—*His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David,* ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, *and declared to be the* SON OF GOD *with power,* ACCORDING TO THE SPIRIT OF HOLINESS, *by the resurrection from the dead.*[7]

Here is a contrast between the two natures of Christ, the term *flesh* denoting his human nature, and the *spirit of holiness* his divine; for the word *spirit* is used frequently by the earliest Christian writers to denote the divine nature of Christ.[8] And by understanding the passage in this

[7] Rom. 1. 3, 4.——[8] See the testimonies of Grotius, on Mark 2. 8. To which the learned Bishop Bull has added others, Def. N. F. p. 19. and brought several texts of scripture to confirm them. Mark 2. 8.—1 Tim. 3. 16.—Heb. 9. 14.—1 Pet. 3. 18. See too Waterland's Importance of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, p. 303, where he produces the sentiments of the Fathers.

Clemens Romanus has a similar distinction:—"From him (Abra-"ham) came our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the flesh. From "him came the kings, and princes, and rulers in Judah." Epis. 1. sect. 32. The distinction made between Christ, and the other persons mentioned, is remarkable, and strongly implies a difference in their natures.

this manner, the contrast is kept up between *flesh* and *spirit*.—A similar contrast is observable in other passages of scripture. St. Peter says,

266.* *Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the* FLESH,[9] *he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.* Acts 2. 30.—But that is the most remarkable in the 9th chapter of this same Epistle:—

267.* *Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.* Rom. 9. 5.

This celebrated text is decisive upon the subject of Christ's divinity, and therefore all possible pains are taken by the Socinians to evade the force of it. Dr. Clarke also has tampered with it in the beginning of his observations upon the passage, but in the close he seems to grant all again, that the most orthodox can desire.[1] Indeed, no honest arts are equal to the business. The expressions are so full, and the contrast between the human and divine natures of the Redeemer so strong, that we must either quite give up the question, or suppose with Dr. Priestley this is one of those many places where "St. Paul reasons inconclusively!"

268. *He*

[9] "So the Apostle teaches concerning his two natures: *Who was* "*made*, says he, *of the seed of David*; this will be man, and the "son of man: *who is declared the Son of God according to the Spirit*, "this will be *God*, and the *Word*, the *Son of God*. We see a double "state, not confused, but joined in one person, Jesus, God and "man.

Tertul. adv. Prax. cap. 27.

[1] See Clarke's Scripture Doctrine, p. 75. See also the excellent observations of Whitby upon the place. Dr. Doddridge says, "I "must render, and paraphrase, and improve this memorable text, "as a proof of Christ's proper Deity, which, I think, the opposers "of that doctrine have never been able nor will ever be able to "answer." See Family Expositor on the place.

Mr. Gilpin in loco, says, "No criticisms on the original have

268.* *He that spared not* HIS OWN SON, *but delivered*
L l *him*

" been able to overthrow its force in proving the divinity of " Christ."

" The title of *God over all*, generally reserved to the Father, " yet is applied to the Son too, by all the ante-nicene fathers, as " well as the post-nicene, in their interpretation of the ninth chap- " ter of the Romans, and fifth verse; but still, God off God."

Vide Fiddes's Theol. Specul. vol. 1. p. 383, 384, 385, 399, 423 and 424.

" Never any ancient Christian, interpreter, or expositor, or any " other writer, did otherwise understand this text, but of Christ; " and not only catholics, but even heretics and schismatics, &c. Dr. Grabe on Whiston's Testimonies, p. 23.—See also Bp. Bull's Works, vol. 3. p. 944, where he asserts the same thing.

Ignatius seems to allude to this text more than once:—" Our " God, Jesus Christ," says he, " was, according to the dispensa- " tion of God, conceived in the womb of Mary, of the seed of " David, by the Holy Ghost." Ep. ad Ephes.

Again:—" Gather yourselves together in the love of Jesus " Christ, who, according to the flesh, is of the race of David, the " the son man, and the son of God." Ibid.

Irenæus, speaking of the generation of Jesus Christ, says, that " he is called *God with us*, lest by any means we should conceive " that he was only a man. *For the Word was made flesh*, not by " the will of man, but by the will of God. Nor should we indeed " surmise Jesus to have been another, but know him to be one and " the same God. This very thing Paul has interpreted:—And " again writing to the Romans concerning Israel, he saith, *Whose* " *are the fathers, and of whom Christ according to the flesh, who is* " *God over all blessed forever.*" Adv. Hær. lib. 3. cap. 18.

Tertullian says, " *Of whom Christ who is God over all blessed* " *for every age.*" Adv. Prax. cap. 13.

Again:—Paul also hath called Christ very God; " *Whose are* " *the fathers, and of whom Christ according to the flesh who is over* " *all God blessed forever.*" Ibid. cap. 15.

St. Cyprian, in his second book against the Jews, produces this text in proof of the divinity of Christ:—" *Whose are the fathers,* " *of whom according to the flesh Christ, who is over all God blessed* " *forever.*" Lib. 2. cap. 6.

We have a remarkable testimony of the same kind in the small treatise of Novatian on the Trinity, which I shall produce at some length:—" But if," says he, " when it belongs to God alone to " know the secrets of the heart, Christ looks into the secrets of the " heart: But if, when it belongs to God alone to forgive sins, the " same Christ forgives sins: But if, when it is not the possible act " of any man to come from heaven, Christ in his advent descended

him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? [2]

This wonderful declaration, like that in the third of John and sixteenth verse, intimates infinitely more than can be expressed by any human tongue, and plainly proceeds upon the supposition, that there is something very peculiar, and far surpassing simple humanity in

" from heaven: But if, when no man can utter this sentence, *I* " *and my Father are one*, Christ alone, from a consciousness of his di- " vinity, declared it: But if, lastly, the apostle Thomas, when " furnished with all the proofs and evidences of the divinity of " Christ, answering, said unto Christ, *My Lord and my God*: But " if the apostle Paul too in his writings says, *Whose are the fathers,* " *and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all* " *God blessed forever*: But if the same person publishes himself to " have been constituted an apostle, *not of men, neither by man, but* " *by Jesus Christ*: But if the same Paul contend for it, that he did " not learn the gospel *from men, neither receive it by man, but by* " *Jesus Christ*; Christ is worthily God." De Trinit. lib. 13.

Let the Reader who has any remaining doubts on his mind concerning the authenticity, or application, of this celebrated text, consult the following authors upon it, in addition to those already mentioned:—Namely,

Waterland's 8 Sermons, p. 421—424.
Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 38, 153, and 193.
Marshall's St. Cyprian, p. 33, note.
Knowles's Primitive Christianity, p. 55 and 80.
Dawson on the Logos, p. 38.
Burgh's Sequel, p. 23—32.
Mills on the place.
Bull's Defence, p. 78.
Petavius, lib. 2. cap. 9. p. 154.
Pearson on the Creed, p. 132.
Randolph's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, part 2. p. 16—22. And
Gnomon Bengelii in loco.

[2] Rom. 8. 32. "There is," says Mr. Blackwell, " a great em- " phasis in the words *spared not his own Son*, which cannot, with " any propriety, be applied to any mere man, or most glorious crea- " ture whatever. *His own Son*, is by way of eminence and dis- " tinction from those who were sons of God by adoption, and the " grace of his own natural Son: and the Father not sparing him, " supposes an antecedent relation of the highest kindness and most " sacred endearment."

Sacred Classics, vol. 1. p. 277.

in the nature and person of Jesus.[3] Upon the hypothesis that he was a mere man, these two, and, indeed, all similar declarations, lose the whole of their force and significance. For what is there so remarkably endearing in the consideration of God's giving up a man like ourselves to extreme sufferings and disgrace, when he had already acted in a similar manner, in every instance where virtuous characters had fallen into the hands of unreasonable and wicked men? Or what was there so condescending in the conduct of our Saviour, when he knew the infinite reward that was set before him? But if Jesus was the real, natural, and proper Son of God, in a manner no other being ever was or can be, the love of God in sparing him from his bosom, and the condescension of Christ in leaving the infinite beatitude of heaven, taking upon him human nature, and dying to redeem the apostate sons of Adam, are conspicuous, and the declarations of Jesus and of Paul are inexpressibly proper, tender, and pathetic.

269.* *Had they known it they would not have crucified the* LORD OF GLORY.[4] 1 Cor. 2. 8.

If this title of our blessed Saviour be compared with the title KING OF GLORY, in the twenty fourth psalm, and the description there given, it will appear to be a name of great weight and significancy. The expression, moreover, implies that he was the *Lord of glory* prior to his crucifixion, otherwise the whole force

[3] "God, we find, hath chosen to express the relation, which the "second person bears to the first, by that of a son to a father. "The first person is called the Father, the second the *Son of God*— "*his own Son—his beloved Son—his one Son—his well-beloved—his "dear Son—his only-begotten Son.* This title must certainly import "something analogous to the relation between an earthly father "and son; and the most natural and obvious sense of it denotes "an equality of nature."

See this subject treated at large by Dr. Randolph, in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, part 2. p. 10—13.

[4] See Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 232.

of it vanishes; or rather, the expression becomes unsuitable to the Apostle's argument.

270.* *The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the* LORD FROM HEAVEN.[5] 1 Cor. 15. 47.

As Adam was originally from the earth, so Christ was originally from heaven. And his dominion, as well as origin, is strongly expressed by the Apostle's saying, *The second man is the* LORD FROM HEAVEN. This text, therefore, according to every fair and probable construction, leaves us no room to doubt concerning the pre-existence of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and implies at the same time that he was in possession of dominion before he came into the world.

271.* *Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also* DESCENDED FIRST *into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended, is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.* Ep. 4. 9, 10. The Apostle here asserts the original pre-existence, and the present immensity of the Saviour of mankind.

272.* *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Maranatha.*[6] The manner in which the

[5] "St. Paul calls Jesus Christ *the Adam from above*; shewing "that he followed the notions of the Jews, who call the Shekinah, the Adam from above, the heavenly Adam, the Adam "blessed, which are the titles that they give only to God."
Allix's Judg. p. 336.

[6] 1 Cor. 16. 22. "Our blessed Lord," says an able vindicator of his dignity and honour, "hath done great and wonderful things "for us. If our respect, duty, and gratitude happen, through "our ignorance and excessive zeal, to rise too high; this is the "overflowing of our good natured qualities, and may seem a pitiable failing. But, on the other hand, if we happen to fall short "in our regards, there is not only ingratitude, but blasphemy in it. "It is degrading, and dethroning our Maker, Preserver, King, and "Judge; and bringing him down to a level with his creatures.

the Apostle here speaks of the necessity of our love to Christ, seems to imply his having a claim to our affection above what any merely human being can be supposed to have. It intimates great merit on the part of Christ, and vast obligation on the part of man.

273.* *All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that* GOD WAS IN CHRIST, *reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled unto God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*[†]

This is a very rich and important passage of holy scripture, and can never be seriously read, without the most grateful wonder, and affection to those adorable Persons, who have pitied our ruined state, and graciously interposed for our salvation. To accomplish this great purpose

" Besides; we have many express cautions given us in scripture, " not to be wanting in our respects and services towards God the " Son; but have no particular cautions against honouring him too " much. We know that we ought to *honour him even as we honour* " *the Father*; which, if it be an ambiguous expression, we are very " excusable in taking it in the best sense, and interpreting on the " side of precept. We know that by dishonouring the Son, we " do, at the same time, dishonour the Father: but we are no where " told, that the Father will resent it as a dishonour done to himself, " if we should chance, out of our scrupulous regards to the Father " and Son both, to pay the Son more honour than strictly belongs " to him. On these and the like considerations (especially when " we have so many, and so great appearances of truth, and such " a cloud of authorities to countenance us in it) the error, if it be " one, seems to be an error on the right hand."

Waterland's Defence of Queries, p. 476, 477.

† 2 Cor. 5. 18—21.

purpose the deity and atonement of Christ seem necessary, and are not obscurely intimated in these words.[8]

There are several passages in the writings of the Apostles which strongly imply some transaction that took place in behalf of man before the foundation of the world. In this transaction there seem to have been more than one person concerned. These surely, from the whole tenor of scripture, could have been no other than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, let their specific natures be what they may. The passages are these:—

274.* *Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son.* Rom. 8. 29:—*The mystery which was kept secret since the world began.* Ibid. 16. 25.—*God hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world.* Ep. 1. 14.—*The eternal purpose which God purposed in Christ Jesus.* Ibid. 3. 11.—*In hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie promised before the world began.* Tit. 1. 2.—*Christ was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times.* 1 Pet. 1. 20. Compare 2. Tim. 1. 9, 10.

From a comparison of these several passages I infer the pre-existence of the Son of God, and that he was in being before the creation of the vast frame of nature. If so, what comes of the Socinian hypothesis?[9]

275.* *Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that* THOUGH HE WAS RICH, *yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich.*[1] The

[8] See Dr. Whitby on this passage, and Jones on the Trinity, p. 13, 14.

[9] The Rev. Andrew Fuller appears to me to have decided the question between the Socinian and Orthodox schemes of religion, with respect to their moral tendency. See his very valuable book entitled, The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems examined and compared.

[1] 2 Cor. 8. 9. See Whitby on this passage.—Dr. Price asks—"When did our Lord possess riches? When did he exchange riches "for poverty in order to make us rich? In this world he was al-

The glorious pre-existence of Christ is here strongly asserted, according to that other signal text of the same Apostle;

" ways poor and persecuted."—Origen says, " Christ Jesus, when " he was rich, became poor; and therefore he chose for a mother, " of whom he should be born, a poor woman, and for the place of " his nativity, a poor town, of which it is said, *And thou, Bethle-* " *hem*, &c." In Levit. cap. 12. 13. hom. 8. ex Erasmi ver- " sione, p. 163.

" This passage, is, in my opinion," says Mr. Hawker, " no in- " considerable argument to prove, that the earliest Christians, and " in the days of the apostles themselves, were not unbelievers of " our Lord's divinity, but orthodox in this great article of our faith. " For the apostle writes to the Corinthians with all the confidence " of one who was mentioning, not a novel thing, but a truth long " since received, and acknowledged. For had this point been at " all questionable, or not fully credited, he surely would not have " said, *Ye know* what they absolutely did not know, had never " heard of before, or perhaps denied. A presumptive evidence at " least this, that the Corinthians were believers in this important " doctrine.—It is impossible to reconcile the apostle's expression in " this passage even with common sense, upon any other terms " than the supposition, that he was writing to a body of men who " were believers in the divinity of Jesus." Sermons, p. 55.

" On the Socinian scheme," says the learned Harwood, " with " what propriety can this be predicted of our Lord? Where and " when was our Saviour rich in this world? His whole history " contradicts this assertion. On the contrary, he was so poor, that " he was obliged to work a miracle to satisfy the demands of some " Jewish collectors. He lived solely upon the beneficence of his " friends. He had no place whereon to lay his head. To inter- " pret this of our Lord being *rich* in miracles, and becoming *poor* " in them at his crucifixion, is such a strange metaphor and mode " of diction, as, I believe, was never employed by any writer, and " such a jejune and forced criticism, as, I imagine, was never stu- " died to explain any author. But on the hypothesis, that our " Lord enjoyed the most exalted station before his embassy to " our world, every thing is consistent and natural. In his pre- " existent state he was *rich* in glory, honour, and happiness: with " a greatness and benevolence of soul, that can never sufficiently " be extolled, he abdicated all this, and became *poor*, that we " through his poverty might become rich. The Apostle's argument " to excite the liberality and beneficence of the Corinthians from " this stupendous act and instance of our Lord's condescension " and benevolence, upon this scheme only, is cogent, apposite, " and very elegant and persuasive."

Of the Socinian Scheme, p. 45.

Apostle; *Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant. Ye* KNOW, says he, *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.* The character of Jesus was no new thing to the Corinthians. They were well acquainted with his previous dignity before he assumed human nature.

276.* *When the fulness of time was come,* GOD SENT FORTH HIS SON, MADE OF A WOMAN, *made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.*[2] Our Saviour's being made of a woman seems to allude to his miraculous conception, and the original promise, that *the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.*

277.* *The love of Christ, which* PASSETH KNOWLEDGE.[3]

Where was the extraordinary love of Christ, if he existed not before he was born of the Virgin, and had no nature higher than mere humanity? To talk of this love as surpassing knowledge, is to burlesque it; seeing many of our fellow mortals have displayed equal affection, with motives infinitely inferior.

278.* *Let*

[2] Gal. 4. 4, 5. "This language is perfectly proper on the "supposition of Christ's pre-existence; but very improper on the "contrary supposition: for how could a mere man be otherwise "made than of a womam?" Price's Ser. p. 136.

I observe here, having omitted it in the proper place, that the first verse of the first chapter of this Epistle, implies that our Saviour is more than a mere man: *Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ:* Jesus Christ, therefore, must be something more than, or different from, simple humanity.

[3] Ep. 3. 19. In what, according to the Socinian scheme, "consisted that love of Christ which *passes knowledge* mentioned by St. "Paul; and that scheme of redemption into which he represents "angels as stooping to look? The one is sunk down into a love which "men have exercised; and the other into a scheme for teaching and "reforming mankind that men could carry on."

Price's Sermons, p. 187.

277.* *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the* FORM OF GOD, *thought it not robbery to be* EQUAL WITH GOD; *but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*[4]

[4] Phil. 2. 5—11. "I have often considered carefully," says Dr. Price, "the interpretation which the Socinians give of these "words; and the more I have considered it, the more confirmed I "have been in thinking it forced and unnatural.—Indeed the turn "and structure of this passage are such, that I find it impossible "not to believe, that the humiliation of Christ, which St. Paul "had in view, was, not his exchanging one condition on earth for "another, but his exchanging the glory he had with God before "the world was, for the condition of a man, and leaving that glory "to encounter the difficulties of human life, and to suffer and die "on the cross. This was, in truth, an event worthy to be held "forth to the admiration of Christians. But if the Apostle means "only that Christ, though exalted above others by working mi-"racles, yet consented to suffer and to die like other men; if, I say, "St. Paul means only this, the whole passage is made cold and "trifling, no more being said of Christ than might have been said "of St. Paul himself, or any of the other Apostles."

The excellent Tillotson has explained this important scripture in a very satisfactory manner:—"That Christ was not only *with* "God," says he, "before he assumed human nature, but also was "*really* God, St. Paul tells us, Phil. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. *Let this* "*mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the* "*form of God,* ουχ αρπαγμον ηγησατο *did not arrogate to himself to be* "*equal with God,* that is, he made no ostentation of his divinity: "for this I take to be the meaning of that phrase, both because it "is so used by Plutarch, and because it makes the sense much more "easy and current, thus, *who being in the form of God, did not as-*"*sume an equality with God*; that is, he did not appear in the glory "of his divinity, which was hid under a veil of human flesh and "infirmity; *but he emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a*

In the introduction to this celebrated text, the Apostle is exhorting to unity and brotherly love, with various other Christian graces, among the most conspicuous of which, are humility and self-denial. And in order to prevail with the people to whom he wrote more effectually, he sets before them the example of Jesus, shewing them how great he was originally, how low he condescended for the salvation of mankind, and what were the happy consequences respecting himself. [5]

So

" *servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in* " *fashion as a man,* or in the habit of a man, *he became obedient* " *to the death,* &c. So that if *his being made in the likeness and* " *fashion of a man* does signify, that he was really man by his in- " carnation, then surely his being in the form of God, when he " took upon him the fashion and likeness of man, and the form of " a servant or slave, must in all reason signify, that he was really " God before he became man: for which reason the same Apostle " did not doubt to say, that *God was manifested in the flesh.*" Ser. 44.

" I have taken the pains to examine nearly all the Fathers of the " three first centuries, who refer to this text: and now I declare, " upon the whole, I have not the smallest doubt remaining upon " my mind, that it is justly translated in our English bible." Burgh's Inquiry, &c. p. 299. See also p. 9, and 144—156.

This being a very important passage of sacred writ I would recommend the reader to consult—

Burnet on the Articles, Art. 2. p. 56. Octavo.
Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 154, &c.
Pearson on the Creed, p. 121, &c.
Waterland's Vindication, &c. p. 14—18.
Knowles's Primitive Christianity, p. 50—56.
Gregory's Divine Antidote, p. 77.
Clarke's Scripture Doctrine, p. 155—161.
Hawker's Sermons, p. 57—60.
Bennet on the Trinity, p. 39—89.
Sherlock's Sermons, vol. 4.
Gnomon Bengelii in loco.
Doddridge in loco.

[5] Dr. Lardner, by far the most learned of Socinians, has four sermons upon this important text of the Apostle. In the first he represents the Orthodox view of the Trinity, in the second the Arian, in the third and fourth his own, which was the Socinian. Whether his sentiment was right or wrong, it must be allowed he was a man of an excellent spirit. One cannot help, however, being surprized, that a person of his talents, should be satisfied with

So that Jesus Christ is evidently spoken of in these words as existing in three very different conditions. *He was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God.*[6] This was the state he was in before he took upon him human nature. Yet, *he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant,*

his own interpretations of scripture. Dr. Price has proceeded nearly in the same manner in his sermons, only he gives the preference to the Arian scheme. He first gives us, what he calls, the Christian doctrine as held by all Christians—then as held by Trinitarians and Calvinists—and, lastly, as held by Unitarians and Socinians.

[6] St. Clement has a passage somewhat like unto this of the Apostle:—"The sceptre of the majesty of God," says he, "our "Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of vain glory and "splendid station, although he was able, but he came in lowliness "of mind."—"If the Lord thus humbled himself, how should we "do who have come under the yoke of his grace." Ep. ad Cor. sect. 16.

St. Barnabas says, "For this end our Lord was content to suffer "for our souls, even though he be Lord of the whole earth, to "whom God said before the formation of the age, *Let us make "man in our image after our likeness.* Ep. Bar. sect. 5.

To the same purpose Irenæus:—"Being invisible, he took "manhood upon himself and became visible; being incomprehen-"sible, he became comprehensible; and being impassible, he be-"came passible; and being the Word, he became man." Adv. Hær. lib. 3. cap. 18.

Again:—"To this purpose our Lord, in these latter times, came "to us, not so as he might have come, but so as we might be "able to behold him; for he might have come to us in his own "unspeakable glory, but we should not have been able to endure "the magnitude of his glory." Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 74.

Clemens Alexandrinus expresses himself in terms of similar import:—"Now," says he, "the Lord himself it was who spake "by Isaiah; he it was who spoke by the mouth of the Prophets: "but if you will not believe the Prophets the Lord himself shall "speak to you, *who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery "to be equal with God:* but the tenderly merciful God, desirous to "save man, *made himself of no reputation.*" Cohort. ad Gentes, p. 8.

I add Tertullian:—The Word is God, *who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* De Resur. Christi, cap. 6. See also Tert. adv. Prax. cap. 7. and Adv. Marcionem, lib. 5. cap. 20.

and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. This was the state to which he humbled himself: in consequence of which unparalleled condescension, *God hath highly exalted him,* in his human nature, *and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* This is the state of honour and immortality to which his human nature is exalted; in consequence of the humiliation and condescension of the divine. And these three conditions of our blessed Saviour are essentially necessary to the Apostle's argument. Take away any one of them, and the propriety of the example is destroyed, and the force of the argument utterly enervated. If we take away his natural and original dignity, then there was no humiliation in becoming man; nor was there any propriety in God's bestowing upon him a reward so infinitely superior to every thing he could have deserved. But if he was by nature the Son of God; if he was originally in the form of God; and then humbled himself to the lowest pitch of poverty and distress to earn salvation for the sons of men, then there was the strictest propriety and decorum in exalting him to the head of the universe.[7]

278* *Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the*

[7] Compare John 17. 5, and 2 Cor. 8. 9, with this important passage, and they will throw light one upon another. No words can more completely subvert the Socinian scheme than these three scriptures do when thus compared with each other.

the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.[8]

279*, *I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.*[9]

In these two passages all the great changes in the natural and moral world are ascribed to the power of Jesus: the resurrection of all human beings in the former, and all moral ability to do good or support evil in the latter: so that, in the opinion of this inspired Apostle, our blessed Saviour is absolutely clothed with omnipotence. But this being one of the incommunicable perfections of the Deity, Jesus Christ, in his higher nature, must be ineffably one with his almighty Father, or we have two omnipotent beings at the head of the universe; which is contrary to the first principles of natural as well as revealed religion.

280.* *By Christ were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.*[1]

I believe

[7] Phil. 3. 20, 21.——[9] Phil. 4. 13.

[1] Col. 1. 16, 17. See Whitby on this passage. Dr. Clarke observes upon it—"Nothing can be more forced and unnatural, "than the Socinian interpretation of this passage; who understand "it figuratively, of the new creation by the gospel." Scripture Doctrine, p. 80.

Bishop Bull too says, "If those words of the Apostle must not "be understood of a creation properly speaking, I should think "the scriptures inexplicable, and that nothing certain can be con- "cluded from the most express passages of them." Defensio Fidei Nicænæ, cap. 1. sec. 15.

It is remarkable that the ancient Arians speak of our Saviour in pretty near the same terms that are here used by the Apostle:— "Before he made the universe, he was constituted God, and Lord, "and King, and Creator of all future worlds. By the will and "command (of his Father) through his own power he made things "in heaven, and things in earth, visible and invisible, bodies and

I believe this scripture may be left to speak for itself. The Being of whom all these great things are predicated must be divine. To suppose otherwise is to throw an impenetrable cloud over all language, and to render the bible the most dangerous book in the world. How any serious and honest mind can be satisfied with the Socinian interpretation is hard to conceive. Judgment, however, belongs not to us. We must therefore leave each other till the grand decisive day. I have no doubt God will be better to us than we usually are to one another.

281.* *It pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell.* [3]

282.* *In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* [3]

283.* *In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.* [4]

I have

" spirits, and caused them out of nothing to come into being." Ser. Arianor. apud August. tom. 8. p. 622.

See too the first book of Irenæus, cap. 19, where he applies this scripture to the first creation.

A learned writer observes upon this remarkable passage of holy scripture, " that our Lord is represented as the *Son of God*, not " only before his incarnation, but antecedently to the creation itself. " And therefore it is a vain and fruitless attempt for any one to en- " deavour to account for the title of *Son*, or *only Son*, from his im- " maculate conception, or even from his Messiahship; both which " are confessedly posterior to that Sonship, which St. Paul speaks " of here; and from whence it may be again observed, that Son of " God and Messiah, though titles belonging to the same person, " are not phrases strictly synonymous."

Fiddes's Theo. Spec. vol. 1. p. 425.

[3] Col. 1. 19.——[3] Col. 2. 3.

[4] Col. 2. 9. Dr. Doddridge says upon this last passage, " I " assuredly believe that as it contains an evident allusion to the " Shechinah in which God dwelt, so it ultimately refers to the ador- " able mystery of the union of the divine and human natures in " the person of the glorious Emanuel, which makes him such an " object of our hope and confidence, as the most exalted creature, " with the most glorious endowments could never, of himself, be." Family Expositor, vol. 5. p. 313.

I have united these three declarations of this eloquent Apostle, because they are all of similar import. And though none of them expressly say that Christ is God, yet they predicate such things of him as no merely human being can be capable of. We may therefore fairly conclude, even from these three passages thus compared, that Christ Jesus the Lord is God and man united in one Mediator for the salvation of the world.

284.* *Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh; justified in the Spirit; seen of angels; preached unto the Gentiles; believed on in the world; received up into glory.*[5]

This is another of those leading passages in the writings of St. Paul, which speaks unanswerably for the pre-existence and divinity of our blessed Saviour. We may cavil with it, and labour to turn it in favour of whatever system we embrace; but, after all our best endeavours, the pre-existence and divinity of the Redeemer will ever recur to the minds of sober and dispassionate

Whitby says upon the same verse, Col. 2, 9, quoting the words of the Ancients, "I conclude, therefore, that the body born of the "Virgin, receiving the whole fulness of the Godhead bodily, was "immutably united to the Divinity, and deified; which made the "same person, Jesus Christ, both God and man."

See also Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 257—264. and Fiddes's Theologia Speculat. vol. 1. p. 426, 427.

[5] 1. Tim. 3. 16. Compare Whitby on the place, and Dr. Clarke's Script. Doct. p. 75. See also an able vindication of the authenticity of the common reading in Pearson on the Creed, p. 127. Consult too Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 156—164; Knowles's Primitive Christianity, p. 49. and Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 262.—For the various readings, see Mills in loco.

The ancient Christian writers abound with language like unto this of the Apostle. Ignatius says—"Christ was with the Father be-"fore all ages, and in the end was made manifest." Ep. ad Mag. sect. 6.—"The love of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour."—"In "our Lord God Jesus Christ."—"Our God Jesus Christ, now "that he is in the Father, doth the more appear."—"God clothed

pasionate readers. They must suppose, either that St. Paul is a very absurd writer, or that there is something truly extraordinary in the character of a person spoken of in this excellent portion of holy scripture. Nor is it necessary they should remain long in doubt concerning it, if they will only be at the pains to compare it with similar declarations in the word of God:—*God with us.* [6] —*The Word was God.* [7] —*The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us:* [8] —*The Life was manifested, and we have seen it:* [9] —*God was in Christ:* [1] —*Unto us a child is born—the mighty God.* [2] —*He that was in the form of God was found in the likeness of men.* [3] —*He that was God blessed for evermore, was also of the seed of David according to the flesh?* [4] All these expressions are applicable to no other being, but the Son of God, and he alone it is, who was manifested in the flesh. [5]

185.* *I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which* THE LORD, THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGE, *shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them*

" in flesh."—" Permit me to be an imitator of the sufferings of my " God."—Justin Martyr says, " Christ is called God, and is, and " will be God."—Dial. cum Try. p. 176.—Tatian his disciple has it:—" We speak not foolishly, O Greeks, nor do we utter " trifles, when we declare unto you, that God was born in the form " of a man."—p. 115.—Origen has a similar declaration, Cont. Cel. l. 1. p. 54.—" God," says he, " was seen in a human " body, for the benefit of our race.

[6] Mat. 1. 23.——[7] John 1. 1.——[8] Ibid. 1. 14.——[9] 1 John 1. 2.——[1] 2 Cor. 5. 19.——[2] Is. 9. 6.——[3] Phil. 2. 6, 7. [4] Rom. 9. 5.

[5] Mr. Gilpin in loco saith, " The expression *God manifest in the " flesh*, is capable, I think, only of one sense."

Bishop Hurd has a good sermon on this text, which the reader would do well to consult. " When the scheme of man's redemp- " tion," says he, " was laid, it was not thought fit that an apos- " tle, a prophet, a man like ourselves, no, nor an angel or archangel, " should be the instrument of it; but that the *Word of God, the " Son of God*, nay *God himself*, as he is here and elsewhere called, " should take this momentous office upon him." Vol. 2. p. 333.

them also that love his appearing. 2 Tim. 4. 7, 8.

The Lord, the righteous judge, whose appearance is to be expected, is undoubtedly descriptive of the character of no other than our blessed Saviour. And is it possible that a mere man should be the judge of men and angels? of all the angels that fell from heaven, and of all the men that ever lived from the beginning to the end of time? No less than the perfections of Deity can be adequate to such an undertaking.

286.* *Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of* THE GREAT GOD AND OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, *who gave himself for us.*[5]

In this passage our Saviour is plainly called THE GREAT GOD: not thereby meaning, that he is the Father, neither the same person as the Father; but that he is the natural and essential Son of the Father, and one with him in dominion, power, and glory. Why too, may not he, who is called GOD. John 1. 1; GREAT GOD. Rev. 19. 17; MIGHTY GOD. Is. 9. 6; and GOD OVER ALL BLESSED FOREVER. Rom. 9. 5; be also called the GREAT GOD in this place?[6]

[5] Tit. 2. 13. See Hammond, Doddridge, and Guise in loco.

[6] "It is highly probable," says Whitby, "that Jesus Christ is "here stiled the GREAT GOD. 1. Because in the original the "article is prefixed only before the *great God*, and therefore seems "to require this construction—*The appearance of Jesus Christ the "great God, and our Saviour.* 2. Because as God the Father is "not said properly to appear; so the word επιφανεια never occurs "in the New Testament, but when it is applied to Jesus Christ, "and to some coming of his. 3. Because Christ is emphatically "stiled *our hope*, and *the hope of glory*, Col. 1. 23, and 1 Tim. 1. 1. "And, lastly, because not only all the ancient Commentators on "the place do so interpret this text, but the Ante-Nicene Fa-"thers also: Hippolytus De Antichrist. sect. 64, speaking of "the appearance of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ; and "Clemens of Alexandria, Admon. ad Gent. p. 5, 6, proving "Christ to be both God and man, our Creator, and the author of "all our good things from these very words of St. Paul."—The

PART SECOND.

SECTION IX.

The DIVINITY of Christ argued from several passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

THERE is no part of the writings of this Apostle, which speaks more excellent things of our blessed Saviour, than the first chapter of his most learned Epistle to the Hebrews. The whole is an admirable piece of reasoning, and eloquent, at the same time, in a very high degree. I verily believe, there is not in the world, a piece of writing equally eloquent and argumentive, equally persuasive and conclusive.[7] It has

" same Clemens saith that Christ is "God"—" the great God"—" and " God over all blessed forever."—See Fleming's Christology, vol. 1. p. 202.—Gill on the Trinity, p. 130.—Clarke on the Trinity, p. 76.—And especially Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 214—218.

Archbishop Tillotson observes upon the verse, that " this cannot " be understood of the appearance of two persons, namely, of the " Father, and his Son Jesus Christ our Saviour; for then the " article would have been added to distinguish them, and it would " not have been και σωτηρος ημων, but και τ̃ σωτηρος ημων, " as if he had said, The appearance of the great God, and of " Jesus Christ our Saviour; when, as according to the propriety " of the Greek, the article being wanting, it ought to be rendered " thus, *Looking for the appearing of Jesus Christ the great God and " our Saviour.*"

Sermon 184.

[7] Dr. Priestley has said this Apostle " often reasons inconclu- " sively." It suits the Doctor's hypothesis to destroy the credit of his writings; for if St. Paul *always reasons conclusively*, Dr. Priestley *often reasons inconclusively*. The attentive reader, therefore, will easily discover whence arises the enmity of the Doctor to this great man and infallible messenger of heaven. I would recommend him, however, to read carefully over, and compare impartially to-

has been said, because St. Paul's name is neither prefixed nor affixed, according to custom in his other writings, therefore he is not the author of this Epistle, but either St. Clement, or some other of the disciples of our Lord. Good reasons, however, may be given, why it differs, in this respect, from those which are universally acknowledged to be his: and, indeed, the Epistle itself, has sufficient internal marks, of its having been written by this truly great and learned man. For, without any disparagement of St. Clement, and other disciples of Jesus Christ, it may be safely asserted, they were none of them equal to the composition of such a discourse. We may, I think, confidently assume, that it is the undoubted work of the first man in the college of the Apostles.

But, without further introduction, let us proceed to the examination of this most sublime description of the person and character of the Son of God, and Saviour of men.

287.* *God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.*[s]

It is very evident from what has been already observed, that the Son of God was the person who conducted

gether, the most celebrated of the Doctor's treatises, whether on moral, religious, or polemical subjects, and this Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, and though he may see abundant reason to admire the zeal and ingenuity of the good Doctor, yet if he does not discover a vast superiority both of stile, matter, manner, eloquence, and solid reasoning, in the composition of the Apostle, he must be as destitute of taste and judgment, as he is of piety and respect for the word of God.

[s] Heb. 1. 1, 2.—"This whole chapter is so replete with terms "denoting the omnipotence and eternity of Christ, and ascribing "to him every divine honour, that the sacred writer seems to la- "bour for expressions to describe the dignity and greatness of his "person."

Hawker's Sermons, p. 64.

ducted all the divine dispensations from the beginning of the world.[9] When therefore the Apostle saith, that God had spoken by the prophets in former ages, and by his Son in these latter days, we are to understand it of his speaking to us more clearly, fully, directly, professedly, and in human form, he having conducted all the prior dispensations under the character of an Angel, or the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[1]

Spoken

[9] Dr. Jortin tells us, that "all the visible or audible manifestations "of God, of which mention is made in the scriptures of the Old "Testament, seem to have been appearances of the *Word* or the "*Son* of God, acting and speaking in his Father's name; as after "the incarnation he acted and spake in his own person; as when he "appeared to St. Stephen, to St. Paul, and to other saints and "disciples. In this the ancient Christians, and most of the moderns are agreed." Sermons, vol. 4. p. 218.

Dr. Clarke speaks somewhat more at large. He says, "It is the "constant doctrine of all the primitive writers of the church, that "every appearance of God the Father in the Old Testament was "Christ appearing in the name or person of the Father in the form of "God, as being the image of the invisible God; Col. 1. 15; of him "whom no man hath seen at any time; John 1. 18; of him whom "no man hath seen or can see; 1 Tim. 6. 16."

Script. Doct. p. 93.

He expresses himself to the same purpose in another part of the same work. "It is the unanimous opinion of all antiquity," says he, "that the Angel, who said, *I am the God of thy fathers*; Acts 7. "30, 31, 32, was Christ (*the Angel of the covenant*; Mal. 3. 1; "*the Angel of God's presence*; Is. 63. 9; and *in whom* the name "of God was; Ex. 23. 21;) speaking in the name and person "of the invisible Father. Thus Gen. 16. 10, *The angel of the "Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly.*—Again: "Gen. 31. 11, 13. *The angel of God spake unto me in a dream* "saying, I am the God of Bethel, where—thou vowedst a vow "unto me. And chap. 48. 15, *Jacob blessed Joseph and said; "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the "God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which "redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.* And Hos. 12. 3, 4, "*He had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel, and "prevailed.* And Zach. 12. 8, *The house of David shall be as "God, as the angel of the Lord.*"

Ibid. p. 105.

[1] This is the strongest objection I have met with to all the Divine

Spoken unto us by his Son: But lest we should suppose he was a son in the same sense in which all mankind are called the sons of God, the Apostle proceeds to describe his nature, his dignity, and his glory:—

288.* *Whom*

appearances being conducted by the Son of God. *The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* God spake by the prophets in former ages, but by his Son in these latter: How then do we say that Christ appeared on so many occasions before he was born of the Virgin? This is a real difficulty, and the best answer I have seen to it is the following one of Bishop Watson in his Collection of Theological Tracts, vol. 1. p. 68.

"May we not distinguish," says this learned Prelate, "between "the Logos as a proxy of Deity, or as personating the glorious "majesty of God in the *Shechinah*, and in that capacity, by the "Holy Spirit, inspiring the prophets, and presiding over the angels at the giving of the law; and the same Logos acting and "speaking to us, in his incarnate state, in the capacity of a prophet? "In the former capacity he may be considered in relation to God, "as personating God, or as in the form of God, whose agent he "was under *every* dispensation which God erected; and therefore "as doing nothing in his own person. For thus, his person would "coincide with that of the supreme God, and is not to be considered as different from him, but as acting in his name and authority. "In the latter capacity he may be considered in relation to *us*, "and to our salvation by the gospel; for the accomplishment of "which, he stooped so far as to take upon him our nature, and, "not as personating God, but in quality of a prophet sent from God, "to publish among us in his own person, and name, the promise of "eternal life.

"And must not this bring us under greater obligations to attend to him; and be sufficient to distinguish him as acting in "delivering the law, and preaching the Gospel? He that was in the "form of God, and represented God, when the law was delivered, "and who delivered it by the ministry of angels and of *Moses*; that "transcendently glorious person afterwards became a man, and in "his *own* person, and by his *own* ministry, delivered to us the "gospel. Doth not this, in a very peculiar manner, recommend "to us the gospel, and oblige us to attend to its doctrines? *Heb.* "1. 1, 2. *God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake* "*in time past unto the fathers* BY THE PROPHETS, *hath in these* "*last days spoken unto us* BY HIS SON, &c. God always spake by "proxy. And the Apostle might speak as he doth, although it "be true, that our Lord was the proxy of Deity under the Old "Testament dispensation. For the Apostle here considers, not "who was the proxy of Deity, but by whom he immediately

288.* *Whom he hath appointed heir of all things.*[2]

Being his Son by nature, he is constituted the heir and possessor of the universe in common with his Father.

289.* *By whom also he made the worlds.*

That Jesus Christ existed before he was born of the Virgin, and, in conjunction with his Almighty Father, was the Creator of the world, is the constant language of the New Testament. Nothing can be more express than the following declarations:—*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things*

" spake to the fathers in the Jewish church, and to us in the Chris-
" tian church. And the opposition lieth between, not the prox-
" ies or representatives of Deity, but between THE PROPHETS
" in the former dispensation, and THE SON OF GOD in the latter.
" By his Son, as his proxy, he spake to the prophets, and by the
" prophets he spake to the Old Testament fathers. But under
" the New Testament his well beloved Son, who before was
" indeed in the form of God, as his proxy, himself became a
" prophet, and in the form of a man spake to us immediately
" as a prophet.

[2] Heb. 1. 2. The interpretation of the Socinians, with Whitby's observation upon it, is worthy of remark: " Christ," say they, " is " made heir of all things in heaven and earth, yea, of heaven and " earth itself; that he is heir and lord of all angels, and of all men " living and dead; that he is absolutely the heir of all things, and " hath the highest empire and dominion over all angels and men; by " which words is signified the highest excellency and divinity, and, " as it were, the unity of Christ with God, though with diversity, in " that he is his Son and Heir, and received this dominion from ano-" ther."

These are the sentiments of Crellius, the celebrated Socinian, with very little variation.

Whitby remarks upon them:—" I believe it is as impossible to " understand how a man should have this empire over all things in " heaven and earth, and over death itself, and yet be a mere man, " as it is to understand any mystery of the Sacred Trinity."

Whitby on the place.

It is but just to observe, that the good Doctor changed his senti-

things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.[3] —*To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.*[4] —Again:—*God created all things by Jesus Christ.*[5] Again:—*By Christ were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him; and by him all things consist.*[6] —Again, in the passage before us; *By whom God made the worlds*, or constituted the ages.—And again in the tenth verse of this same chapter; *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands.*[7] St. Peter also is very satisfactory upon the same subject:—*For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water.*[8] These seven passages, when considered in their context, and compared one with another, render it as clear as any thing well can be, that Jesus Christ was, with his Father, the Creator of the world. If this is not a certain, and infallible conclusion, I am clearly of opinion, it is utterly in vain, to attempt to prove any proposition whatever from the word of God. We may infer, therefore, with all the assurance

ments before he died, and wrote several things on the Arian side of the question.

[3] John 1. 1, 2, 3.—[4] 1 Cor. 8. 6.

[5] Ep. 3. 9.—Dr. Price says, "The creation of the world by Jesus "Christ is a fact that raises our ideas of his pre-existent dignity "higher than any thing else that is said of him in the New Testa-"ment."

Sermons, p. 142.

[6] Col. 1. 16, 17.——[7] Heb. 1. 10.

[8] 2 Pet. 3. 5. Dr. Whitby says upon this declaration of St. Paul, *By whom also he made the worlds*, that this was the doctrine of all the primitive Fathers from the beginning, as well as of all the Commentators on this text. See his notes upon it.

surance of conviction and demonstration, that the Son of God was the Creator of the world. [9]

290.* *Who being the brightness of his glory.*

After having ranked Jesus Christ above all the ancient prophets, telling us, that he was the Son of God, the Heir of all things, the Constitutor of the ages, and the Creator of the universe, he proceeds still farther, and attempts to describe his natural and essential glory. Language, however, seems to fail him, and he recurs to expressions taken from those who have gone before him in the same province, but which are extremely difficult either to explain or understand. *The Son*, says he, *is*

[9] Dr. Clarke says, "The Socinian interpretation of these words—"*All things were made by him*—that the new creation was made "by him, or all things relating to the dispensation of the gospel "were done by him, is extremely forced and unnatural." Scripture Doctrine, p. 79.

The reader will not be sorry, perhaps, to see here the opinions of several of the Successors of the Apostles:—St. Barnabas declares, that Christ is "the Lord of the world, the Maker of the sun, the "person by whom, and to whom are all things."——Justin Martyr says, "He is the Word by which the heaven, the earth, and "every creature was made, by whom God at the beginning made "and ordained all things, namely, the heavens and the earth, and by "whom he will renew them."—This Irenæus delivers as the rule of faith contained in the scripture. Some of his declarations, for he repeats the same thing many times over, are these:—"There is "one Almighty God who built, fitted, and made all things out of "nothing by his Word.—Many barbarous nations, who held the "ancient tradition, did believe in one God, the Maker of heaven "and earth, and of all things therein, by Jesus Christ, the Son of "God."

Athenagoras says, "Our doctrine celebrates one God the Creator "of all things, who made all things by Jesus Christ, from whom, "and by whom all things were made."

See much more to the same purpose in Whitby on the place.—Consult also—

Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 48, 100 and 108.
Waterland's Vindication, p. 23, 188, &c.
Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 38, 122, &c. and 168, &c.
Fiddes's Theologia Spec. vol. 1. p. 402, 403.
Randolph's Vindication, &c. p. 12, 13.
Clarke's Scrip. Doct. p. 118, 264, &c. and 282, &c.

is the brightness of his Father's glory: [1] the resplendence, the shining forth, the beam, the effulgent ray of his glory. All these expressions have been used by learned men to explain the Apostle's meaning, and to convey some idea of the infinite brightness and splendor of his nature. The ancient Jews, from whom St. Paul copied, had recourse to similar language, when they wanted to describe the nature of Wisdom, which was no other with them than the Son of God. For the Book of Wisdom says of her, that "she is an efflux of the sincere glory of "the Almighty, and the splendor of eternal light." [2] And the learned Philo saith of the Logos, that "he is "the most illustrious and splendid light of the invisible "and highest God." [3]—Plotinus informs us, that "he is a light streaming forth from God, even as "brightness doth from the sun." He calls him "the "Son of God," and says, that "being the Word of "God, and the Image of God, he is inseparably con-"joined with him." [4]

Some of the Christian fathers suppose, that this figurative expression of the Apostle is taken from the material sun. Hence Justin Martyr saith, "The Son "proceedeth from the Father, as the light of the sun "in the firmament from its own body, without any di-"vision or separation from it." [5] Others say, "He "proceedeth, as fire is kindled from fire, without the "diminution of the fire that kindled it, or as one torch "is lighted from another." [6] Accordingly the creed called Nicene expresses the procession of the Son from

[1] Dionysius Alexandrinus says, that "Christ is the splendor of "the eternal light, and he himself is altogether eternal: for as the "light always exists, so it is manifest the splendor must always ex-"ist." Apud Athanas. de sent. Dionys. p. 253. See Waterland's Vindication, p. 21.

[2] Ch. 7. 25, 26.——[3] De Somn. p. 448.

[4] For other expressions of a similar kind see the fifth part of this Apology, and Scott's Christian Life, vol. 5. p. 137, 138.

[5] Dial. with Trypho, p. 358.——[6] Tatian and Tertullian.

the Father by saying, that he is, " God off God, Light " off Light, very God off very God."

291.* The Apostle goes still farther: *The Son is the express image of the Father's person.*

On other occasions he calls Christ *the image of God,*[7] and *the image of the invisible God:*[8] but here he is called, *the express image of his person:** the impression, the representation of his subsistence, or the full delineation of his person. In this passage as well as the former the Apostle had in his eye the expressions which occur in the Jewish authors who preceded him: for Wisdom is called again, " the unspotted mirror of " the power of God, and the image of his goodneſs."[9] And Philo saith too, that " the Logos is the eternal " image of God, by which the whole world was " made."[1] Nay, he uses the very same expression, when speaking of the Son of God, which the Apostle here doth, saying, " He is the character," the express image, " of God," answering to his Father's person, as the impression made upon wax by a seal, answers to the seal by which it is made. And no being, I think, can make any such high pretensions as these, but one that is truly and properly divine.

The

[7] 2 Cor. 4. 4.——[8] Col. 1. 15.

* " If he be the image of the Invisible, the image itself must be " invisible too. I will be bold to add, that since he is the resem- " blance of his Father, there could not have been a time when he " was not." Origen apud Athan. taken from Dr. Waterland's Defence of some Queries, p. 20. The learned Doctor observes in the place, that Origen goes on to argue, that since God is light, and Christ he Απαυγασμα, or shining forth of that light, quoting this text, that they could never have been separate one from the other, but must have been co-eternal.

[9] Wisdom, ch. 7. 26.

[1] De Monar. p. 363 and De Con. Ling. p. 267.

[2] De Agricult. liber 2.

The Apostle proceeds still further in his description of the Son of God. Having described his eternal divinity, and represented him as the Creator of the world, he then tells us, that

292.* *He upholds all things by the word of his power.*

This is an expression similar to that of the same Apostle in his Epistle to the Coloſſians, where it is said, *He is before all things, and by him all things consist.* But then, what a contrast is here? THE SON OF GOD—THE HEIR OF ALL THINGS—THE CONSTITUTOR OF THE AGES—THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS FATHER'S GLORY—THE EXPRESS IMAGE OF HIS PERSON—AND THE SUSTAINER OF THE UNIVERSE—BECAME AN ATONING SACRIFICE FOR THE SINS OF THAT WORLD WHICH HIS OWN HANDS HAD MADE:

293.* For *by himself he purged our sins.* [3]

Amazing condescension! grace unknown! After the

[3] The ingenious Mr. Gilpin obſerves upon the 18th verſe of the 10th chapter of this Epiſtle, "that whoever examines ſeriouſly St. "Paul's application of the Jewiſh rites of atonement, to the death "of Chriſt, in ſeveral parts of this Epiſtle, muſt either, I think, "deny the authenticity of theſe paſſages, or believe the doctrine "of the atonement."

Biſhop Burnet has treated of the doctrine of atonement in his Expoſition of the thirty nine Articles, art. 2. p. 65—68, octavo, with his uſual perſpicuity, and Biſhop Butler in his Analogy, part 2. ch. 5. has ſhewn, that it is perfectly reaſonable, and agreeable to the common courſe of nature. Grotius's book on the ſame ſubject is deciſive.—It has been obſerved on the 26 page of this Apology, that Grotius has been claimed by the Socinians as favouring their opinions. Several of his expoſitions of the New Teſtament, it muſt be allowed, are much the ſame with theirs; and, it is remarkable, that perſons of very different ſentiments have conſidered him as friendly to their ſeveral opinions. The fact is, I ſuppoſe, that he was of different ſentiments at different periods of his life, as many other good men have been. See, however, a ſatisfactory vindication of this great man from Socinianiſm, in the 6th book of his Life written by M. De Burigny.

Lamb of God had for this purpose been slain, and the atonement made and accepted, which was fully manifested to the world by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, *he sat down on the right-hand of the majesty on high*, in his glorified human nature, in place and dignity infinitely superior to the highest archangel in the kingdom of heaven: yea, as much superior as God's only-begotten Son, who must be of the same nature with himself, is superior to the work of his own hands:

294. *Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.*

Such is the account, which is here given of the Son of the HIGHEST! I don't exaggerate the matter when I say, that human language wants terms to convey ideas of a more exalted kind. What could have been said to elevate his character that is not said? We know of nothing higher, nothing greater, nothing better, nothing more sublime than this description. The Son is every thing, but the Father, the original and fountain of Deity. And that he could not be, because he is the Son. Every thing else he is which implies equality. He is—give me leave to repeat the glorious declarations—he is—THE SON OF GOD—THE HEIR OF ALL THINGS—THE CONSTITUTOR OF THE AGES—THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS FATHER'S GLORY—THE EXPRESS IMAGE OF HIS PERSON—THE SUSTAINER OF THE UNIVERSE. And, having assumed human nature in the womb of the Virgin, HE LIVED a proper time in the world, and then DIED TO PURCHASE REDEMPTION FOR THE SOULS WHICH HE HAD MADE.

From all these considerations united, it is very evident we cannot think of our blessed Saviour too highly, love him too intensely, or expect too much from him.*

295.* *And,*

* There was a valuable discourse published in the year 1794,

295.* *And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* [5]

These

entitled a Demonstration of the true and eternal Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in opposition to the attacks of the present age, which obtained the gold medal of the Hague Society. It was written by the learned Dutchman Dr. Dionysius Van De Wynpersse, professor of Mathematics and Astronomy at Leyden. He divides the whole into twenty one sections, in which, among other matters, he considers—the divine names of Christ—the divine properties—the divine works—and the divine honour. He afterwards considers him as the author of our salvation—and the propitiation for our sins. The twelfth section is the relation of Christ to his church—then, the authority of Christ over all God's ambassadors—Christ the spirit of ancient prophecy—the divinity of Christ the power of the gospel—the coming of Christ to judgment—the adoration of Christ—the rejection of Christ—the relation of Christ to God the Father—the relation of Christ to the Holy Spirit—the conclusion.—The nature of the treatise will be seen from these particulars. It is called a Demonstration: and, indeed, so it is, as far as religious subjects are capable of this kind of evidence. Scripture being judge, it admits of no conclusive answer.

[5] Heb. 1. 10, 11, 12. See Whitby on the place, and Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 250. The same learned Author vindicates the above application of this quotation from the book of psalms in the manner following.

"It is not without good reason," says he, "that we understand "Heb. 1. 10. of Christ.

"1. The context itself favours it. The verse begins with, "και συ, which properly refers to the same who was spoken of "immediately before in the second person. The σε preceding and "συ following, answer to each other. A change of person, while "the same way of speaking is pursued, must appear unnatural.

"2. The scope and intent of the author was to set forth the "honour and dignity of the Son above the angels; and no cir-"cumstance could be more proper than that of his creating the "world.

"3. If he had omitted it, he had said less than himself had done "before in the second verse, of which this seems to be explanatory, "and as he had brought proofs from the Old Testament for several

These words are taken from the 102 psalm. There they are descriptive of the immutability of the Father. But here, being applied to our blessed Saviour by an inspired Apostle, they are equally descriptive of his immutability also. Language admits not of expressions more pointed and decisive.

296.* *Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, that he might taste death for every man.*——HE TOOK NOT ON HIM THE NATURE OF ANGELS; *but he took on him the seed of Abraham.* * Surely these expressions fully imply pre-existence, and that Christ was originally superior in nature to the angels.

297.* *Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High-Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that*

" other articles, nothing could be more proper or more pertinent, " than to bring a proof from thence of this also.

" 4. Declaring him to be Jehovah, and Creator of the universe " might be very proper to shew that he was no ministering spirit, " but συνθρονος; *sitting at the right hand of God*, which immedi- " ately follows.

" 5. To introduce a passage here about God's immutability " or stability, must appear very abrupt, and not pertinent; because " the Angels also, in their order and degree, reap the benefit of " God's stability and immutability. And the question was not " about the duration and continuance, but about the sublimity and " excellency of their respective natures and dignities.

" 6. I may add, that this sense is very consonant to antiquity, " which every where speaks of the Son as Creator, and in as high " and strong terms: such as these, τεχνιτης, δημιουργος, ποιητης, " ανθρωπων, αγγελων, των παντων, των ολων, τυ κοσμυ and " the like."

Waterland's Defence of Queries, p. 95.

* Heb. 2. 9, 16. " Consider here how absurd it would be to " mention, as an instance of condescension and merit in a mere " man, that he submitted to be made lower than the angels, and that " he assisted not them but the seed of Abraham."

Price's Sermons, p. 136.

See Whitby on Heb. 2. 16.

that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as HE WHO HATH BUILDED THE HOUSE, HATH MORE HONOUR THAN THE HOUSE. *For every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but* CHRIST AS A SON OVER HIS OWN HOUSE; *whose house we are, if we hold fast the confidence, and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.* [7]

In these words the Apostle represents our Saviour as the builder and founder of the Jewish church. This is an argument unanswerable for his pre-existence. He represents him also as Son of God, and Master of his own house. This is an argument of his real and proper divinity.

298.* *The* WORD *of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart: neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked, and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.* [8] Some

[7] Heb. 3. 1—6. See Whitby on the place, and Fiddes's Theologia Speculativa, vol. 1. p. 428. Consult also Hawker's Sermons, p. 68—72, where there is a good illustration.

[8] Heb. 4. 12, 13. See Whitby on the place, and Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 256, 257, where it is applied to Christ with accumulated evidence.

Clemens Alexandrinus says, "The Son of God never comes down "from his watch-tower, as never being divided, never parted asun- "der, and never passes from place to place, but is always every "where, and contained no where; all mind, all the Father's light, "all eye, sees all things, hears all things, knows all things, and by "his power searches the powers. Strom. l. 7. See page 234 of this Apology, where this same passage is produced, only with a little variation in the translation.

Some of our most valuable authors apply these words to the Son of God, and others to the written word of God. It was applied to our Saviour by some of the Christian fathers, both before and after the council of Nice. If this application is just, the passage contains a clear proof of the omniscience of the Son of God; which is one of the incommunicable perfections of the Divine Being.

299.* *See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth.* Heb. 12. 25, 26. Do not these words suppose, or rather assert, that it was Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, who spake from mount Sinai at the giving of the law? See Doddridge in loco.

300.* *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever.*[s]

These words, when considered in the context, seem strongly expressive of the immutability of our blessed Saviour; the sense being the same as, *he who is, who was, and who is to come.* Some apply the expression to the doctrine instead of the person of Christ. The reader will consult the context and form his own judgment.—These several passages, from the writings of this pre-eminent Apostle, either convey to us the idea of uncreated excellency, in the nature of the Redeemer, or it must be allowed, that he was, not only not inspired, but a most unfortunate interpreter of his heavenly Master's will, and a reasoner in the highest degree inconclusive.[t]

* Heb. 13. 8. See the above sense of the passage well defended by Dr. Waterland in his Eight Sermons, p. 251—253. Consult also Doddridge and Guise on the place.

[t] See this Apostle's character rescued from the dishonourable aspersions of Dr. Priestley in Lord Littleton's Observations on the Conversion of St. Paul, and in Mr. Locke's Preface to his Essay on St. Paul's Epistles. Consult too my Strictures on Religious Opinions, p. 110—114.

PART SECOND.

SECTION X.

The DIVINITY of Christ argued from several passages in the Gospel of St. John.

THE writings of St. John, the beloved disciple of our Lord, come next under consideration. We have already selected such parts of them as our Saviour himself is said to have uttered, and the reasonings of the Jews upon them; but we will now proceed to those parts, where the Apostle delivers his own sentiments concerning the person and character of his Lord and Master. He was the last of all the Apostles, and is said to have composed his Gospel* and Epistles in his old

* Irenæus and Jerome inform us, that St. John was requested by the Bishops of Asia to write his gospel against the rising heresies of Cerinthus and Ebion. And it is remarkable, that these two heretics (especially the latter) were in many respects the same as our modern Socinians. They both denied the real and proper divinity of Christ. They both considered him as a mere man. They were both written against by this Apostle, by Ignatius, by Justin, by Irenæus, by Tertullian, and by several others. Ought not this consideration to have some weight with Dr. Priestley and his admirers?

Irenæus says, "St. John, the disciple of our Lord, designing to "extirpate that error, which had been sowed by Cerinthus, and a "great while before by the Nicolaitans, who are a branch of that "heresy which is falsely called KNOWLEDGE, that he might con-"found them, and persuade them that there is one God who made "all things by his WORD; and that the Creator of the universe, "and the Father of our Lord, were not, as they pretended, dis-"tinct beings, wrote his gospel."

Adv. Hæreses, l. 3. c. 11.—See also, l. 1. c. 26. Consult likewise Euseb. Ecc. Hist. l. 6. c. 14.

St. Jerome's words are:—"John wrote his Gospel last of all, "at the desire of the Bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other "heretics, and the heresy of the Ebionites, which began to pre-"vail exceedingly at that time, who asserted that Christ was not

age, about the year of our Lord ninety, and the book of Revelation five or six years afterwards. Learned men, however, are not agreed as to the precise year when the several works of this Apostle were composed, nor even which of them was written first. Yet it is generally supposed that the book of Revelation was composed first, while he was in the island of Patmos in the Ægean sea. This holy man seems to have had a larger share of the Spirit of illumination, and of course, spake more fully concerning the divine nature of our blessed Saviour, than any other of the Evangelists. Hence we find, that each of his three larger works opens with a description of the PERSON of his beloved Master. A few general observations upon some parts of these invaluable compositions, may not be inexpedient, and will close our evidence from the holy scriptures for the divinity of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And, as the Gospel is first in importance, we will commence our observations on the writings of this Apostle with the introduction to that Gospel:

301.* *In*

" before the virgin Mary, upon which account also he was forced " to declare his divine original."*

The same author in another place speaks in the following manner:—" St. John the Apostle and Evangelist being in Asia, and " the heresies of Cerinthus, Ebion, and others, who denied that " Christ was come in the flesh, and whom he also in his Epistle " calls Antichrists, springing up at that very time, he was compelled " almost by all the then Bishops of Asia, and the messages of " many churches, to write concerning our Saviour's divinity more " particularly. Whence it is also related in church history, that " being urged by his brethren to write, he promised that he would, " provided they would all keep a fast, and implore the assistance of " God on his behalf, which being accordingly performed, he was " filled with the Holy Ghost, and immediately dictated as from " heaven that Procœmium, *In the beginning was the Word*, &c."

Catal. Script. Eccles. in Johann.—Dr. Priestley allows that Ebion was contemporary with St. John. Letters to Dr. Horsley, p. 18.

* Cat. Script. Procem. in Mat.

301.* *In the beginning,*[3] says this most divine author, *was*[4] *the* WORD,[5] *and the* WORD *was with God,*

[3] That is, says Grotius, "When first the universe began to be "created."

[4] The WORD was even then. It was customary, says the same learned man, with the Hebrews, to express eternity in this popular manner.

In what view we are to consider the eloquent Historian of the Decline and Fall of the Roman empire I undertake not here to determine. Dr. Priestley and others have treated him in the light of an Infidel. Be this as it may, he is clearly of opinion, that St. John considered the LOGOS as a divine person. This, indeed, is what every man must suppose, I should think, where there is no preconceived system to support. Mr. Gibbon's words are:—"The "Christian Revelation, which was consummated under the reign of "Nerva, disclosed to the world the amazing secret, that the LOGOS, "who *was with God*, from the beginning, *and was God*, who "had made all things, and for whom all things had been made, "was inearnate in the person of Jesus of Nazareth; who had been "born of a virgin, and suffered death on the cross.—The pre-ex- "istence, and divine perfections of the LOGOS, or Son of God, "are clearly defined in the gospel of St. John." Vol. 2. p. 240, 241. 4to.

The same Mr. Gibbon, in his Life written by himself, says, that "Dr. Priestley's Socinian shield has repeatedly been pierced "by the spear of Horsley."

[5] The term WORD, or LOGOS, made use of here by the Apostle, was extremely common among the ancient Jews; and, among other things, frequently signified the second hypostasis in the Divine Nature. The book of Wisdom saith, "Thine *almighty Word* leapt "down from heaven out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man of "war, into the midst of a land of destruction." Ch. 18. 15—17. —The Chaldee paraphrasts speak of the LOGOS in like manner with St. John in this chapter. Thus, Gen. 31. 22. "The WORD "from before the Lord came to Laban." And Ex. 20. 19. "Let not the WORD from before the Lord speak with us, lest we "die." So Is. 45. 12. "I by my WORD have made the earth, "and created man upon it." And also Ex. 20. 19. "Let not "the Lord speak with us by his WORD which is before the Lord."

Philo uses the term LOGOS in the same sense upon abundance of occasions. Thus: "The WORD of God is over the whole world, "and more ancient than all creatures." De Leg. Alleg. l. 2. p. 93. "The sacred WORD," says he in another place, "commands "some as a king what they ought to do." De Vita. Mos. p. 593.

Amelius, the Heathen philosopher, applies this introduction of

and the WORD *was God. The same was in the beginning*

St. John's gospel in like manner to the second hypostasis. See the Heathen testimonies in the 6th part of this Apology.

Julian the Apostate, the most inveterate enemy Christianity ever had, makes this remarkable confession:—"That WORD which he "(John) saith was God, he also declares was Jesus Christ, the "person acknowledged by the Baptist." Jul. apud Cyr. l. 10.

Mahomet in his Koran saith, "Eise, or Jesus, is the WORD of "God; and his being, the WORD of God, is reputed among the "Saracens as the proper name of Jesus Christ, so that no other "man is called by his name, but Jesus only, whom in Arabic they "call Eise." See Lightfoot's Works, vol. 1. p. 394.

The Christian fathers are unanimous in their application of this introduction to the Son of God.

Ignatius calls Christ, "The *eternal* WORD of God." Ep. ad Mag. sect. 8.

Justin Martyr says, "The Son is the WORD, which afterwards "by incarnation was made man." Sec. Ap. p. 74.

Again: "Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the WORD "of God." Ibid. p. 98. See too p. 284.

Caius says, "All, the just and the unjust, shall be brought before "God the LOGOS; for the Father hath given all judgment unto "him." Frag.

Irenæus saith:—"John, preaching the one almighty God, and the "one only-begotten Son Christ Jesus, by whom all things were made, "saith, that this person is the Son of God; that this person is the "only-begotten, that this person is the maker of all things, that "this person is the true light, who lighteth every man, that this "person is the maker of the world, that this is he who came unto "his own, that this same person was made flesh, and dwelt among "us." Lib. 1. cap. 1.

Here we see, this learned and pious martyr, who was the disciple of Polycarp, the scholar of St. John, applies all the leading characteristics of these introductory verses to our blessed Saviour in the fullest manner. Several other passages in the writings of this venerable Father are altogether to the same purpose.

"Thou art not unmade," says he, "O man, neither didst thou "always co-exist with God, as his own WORD hath done." Ibid. l. 2. c. 43.

And again: "There is one God the Father, who is over all; "and one WORD of God, who is through all, by whom all things "were made; and this world is his property, and was made "through him by the will of the Father—for the WORD of God "was truly the maker of the world."

Clemens Alexandrinus says:—"For both are one God, because "he said, *In the beginning the* WORD *was with God, and the* WORD "*was God.*" Pæd. lib. 1. c. 8.

beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men, and the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John: the same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him; and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the WORD

Novatian speaks to the same purpose:—"This is that WORD, "which *came unto his own, and his own received him not.* For *the* "*world was made by him, and the world knew him not.*—If Christ "was only a man, how, coming into this world, came he to his "own, since no man could make the world." De Trinit. c. 13, 14.

Origen, speaking of this introduction, says, "Who, though in "the beginning he was with God, yet, for the sake of those who "are shackled by the flesh, and therefore fleshly, was himself made "flesh, that he might be comprehended by those who could not "by any other means look upon him, inasmuch as he was the "WORD, and *was with God, and was God.*—For God, the WORD, "is not to be comprehended—and the Son being incomprehensible, "inasmuch as he is God the WORD, by whom all things were "made, and dwelt among us." Cont. Cels. lib. 6. p. 322, 323.

Athenagoras says, "The Son of God is the WORD of the Fa-"ther in power and energy; by him and through him were all "things created.—The Son of God is the WORD and Wisdom of "God.—From the beginning, God being an eternal mind, must "have had, from all eternity, the WORD in himself, and as the "Wisdom and Power, he exerted himself in all things."

Apol. p. 10.

WORD[a] *was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory; the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.*

This introduction is of the first importance in ascertaining the personal character of our blessed Saviour; and therefore every effort is used by the patrons of the different schemes of religion, to make it speak a language agreeable to the system adopted by each party. That the reader may have the satisfaction of seeing and judging for himself, I will set down at one view the interpretations which are given to this passage by the patrons of the several schemes.

The Sabellian interpretation runs thus: "Before "the creation of the world, Reason did exist, for Rea- "son was then in God, indeed was God himself, it "not being possible for God to be without it; Reason, "I say, did exist in God before the creation of the "world, every portion of which was created with the "greatest Reason; nor can any thing be produced that "has been made without it."

This is Le Clerc's interpretation of the three first verses, and, in my opinion, carries its own refutation on the face of it.

The

[a] Ignatius says, "Christ was of the race of David, of the virgin "Mary; who was truly born, and did eat and drink." Ad Tral. sect. 9.

Tertullian stiles Christ, "God off God, and man off the flesh of man." De Carne Christi, cap. 17.

Again: He elsewhere calls him, "God and man without doubt "according to the substance of each nature, yet distinct in their "respective proprieties." Adv. Prax. cap. 27.

Novatian writes to the same purpose:—"The Son of God de- "scended, who, while he took upon himself the son of man, made "him of consequence the Son God, because the Son of God did "assume and unite him to himself." De Trinit. cap. 19.

Gregory Nazianzen to the same purpose:—"We do not part "the humanity from the Deity, but believe Christ to be one person; "at first, indeed, not man, but God, and the only-begotten Son of "God before all ages, without a body; but in the end a man also." Orat. 51.

The Socinian interpretation, which was never heard of in the world for fifteen hundred years after Christ, is to this effect:

"In the beginning of the Gospel, was the man "Christ Jesus, otherwise called the Word. He was "with God, having been taken up into heaven before "he entered on his ministry. And he was God, having the office, honour, and title of a God conferred "upon him after his resurrection. The same was in "the beginning of the Gospel with God. All things "belonging to the Gospel-state were reformed and "renewed by him; and without him was there not any "thing reformed or renewed."

This interpretation, likewise, as it appears to me, carries its own refutation along with it.[7]

The

[7] The above view of the Socinian interpretation of the three first verses of this introduction is taken from Dr. Waterland's Eight Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, and is, I believe, as accurate as is necessary. Dr. Priestley, who is at the head of his party in this country, is very wavering and changeable in his sentiments, and therefore one is at a loss how to represent his opinions. He has, however, given us the following view of this introduction in his "Familiar Illustration," which seems to be partly Sabellian and partly Socinian:—"Many of the texts which are usually alledged "in proof of the divinity of Christ," says this Divine, "relate to "God the Father only. One of the most remarkable of these is "John 1.—To me it appears, that the Apostle does not speak "of the pre-existence of Christ in this place; but only of the "power and wisdom of God, which dwelled, or tabernacled in his "flesh; and that he probably meant to condemn some false opinions concerning the logos (which is the Greek for word) which "are known to have prevailed in his time. Now, in contradiction "to them, the Apostle here asserts, that by the Word of God, "we are not to understand any being distinct from God; but only "the *power* or *energy* of God, which is so much *with God*, that "it properly belongs to his nature, and is not at all distinct from "God himself; and that the same power which produced all "things was manifest to men in the person of Jesus Christ, who "was sent to enlighten the world; that though his power made the "world, it was not acknowledged by the world, when it was revealed in this manner, not even by God's peculiar people, the "Jews; and notwithstanding this power was made manifest in a "more sensible and constant manner than ever it had been before,

The Arian interpretation comes nearer to the truth, and is therefore more plausible and dangerous. For there is as much difference between it and the orthodox faith as between the self-existent Jehovah and the work of his hands. This construction of St. John, which was never openly propagated till the beginning of the fourth century, is as follows:

" In the beginning of all things, before ever the " earth or the world was made, there existed a very " glorious and excellent creature, since called the Word, " the Oracle of God, and Revealer of his will. That " excellent person, the first whom God of his own good " pleasure and free choice gave being to, was with God " the Father; and he was God, another God, an in- " ferior God, infinitely inferior; but yet truly God, as " being truly partaker of divine glory then, and fore- " ordained

" dwelling in human flesh, and tabernacling, or abiding some con- " siderable time among us; so that his glory was beheld, or made " visible to mortal eyes, and was full of grace and truth."

I could wish the reader would consult the Rev. Mr. Shepherd's Free Examination of the Socinian Exposition of these verses, where the absurdity of it is made fully to appear. To say, as Dr. Priestley does, that these introductory verses of St. John's gospel " re- " late to God the Father only," is an arbitrary and unfounded assumption, which no abilities can justify. He had better assert upon this occasion, as he does upon another, that " rather than admit " the commonly received interpretation, he would suppose the " whole introduction to be an interpolation, or that the old Apostle " dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another."*

The learned Sandius confesses, that Socinus's sense of this introduction to St. John's gospel " was wholly new and unheard of " in the ancient church; not only among the fathers, but the he- " retics."† And the no less learned Dr. Randolph assures us, that " it is certain all Christian writers have quoted this text, and " argued from it, as a clear proof of the eternity and divinity of " the Son." See his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, part 2. p. 30, where the reader will find a considerable number of testimonies from the Fathers, in addition to those I have produced above.

* See Defences of Unitarianism for the year 1787, p. 58.

† See Bishop Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 125.---Dr. Doddridge says upon this introduction to St. John's gospel---" I am fully sensible of the sublime " and mysterious nature of the doctrine of Christ's deity, as here declared, and " it is a matter of conscience with me thus strongly to declare my belief of it."

" ordained to have true dominion and authority in God's " own time. God employed him as an instrument, or " under-agent, framing and fashioning the world of " inferior creatures; and approved of his services so " well as to do nothing without him." [s]

Dr. Clarke's observations upon this introduction to the gospel of St. John are as follow:—*In the beginning;* " before all ages; before the creation of the world; " before the world was, John 17. 5. And verse 3d. " of this chapter, *All things were made by him, and* " *without him was not any thing made that was made.* " And verse 10, *The world was made by him.* Thus " was this phrase constantly understood in the primitive church. And nothing can be more forced and " unnatural, than the interpretation of the Socinian " writers, who understand, *In the beginning*, to signify " only, At the first preaching of the gospel.

" *Was the Word.* The Word, the Oracle of God, " the great Revealer of the will of God to mankind. " Rev. 1. 5, *The faithful witness.* Rev. 3. 14, *The* " *faithful and true witness.* Rev. 19. 11, *Faithful and* " *true.* Rev. 19. 13, And his name is called, *The* " *Word of God.* The Word, the Interpreter, and " Messenger of his Father. Athanas. contra Gentes.

" *And the Word was with God.* Not εν τω θεω, but " προς τον θεον, *was present with God. Was with the* " *Father*, 1 John 1. 2. *Had glory with God before the* " *world was*, John 17. 5. *I was by him as one brought* " *up with him*, Prov. 8. 30.

" *And the Word was God.* Was that visible person, " who under the Old Testament appeared εν μορφη " θεϐ, *in the form of God*, Phil. 2. 6. In whom the " name of God was, Ex. 23. 21. God, the angel " of the Lord, Zech. 12. 8; Hosea 12. 3, 4; Gen. " 31. 11, 13; and Gen. 48. 15, 16.—Μετοχη της του

[s] See Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 14, 15.

" Αυτοθεν θεοτητος θεοποιυμενος, God by communication " of Divinity from him who is of himself God: Ori- " gen in Johan: p. 46, Huetii.

" If this be the right interpretation of the text; " then the words Εν αρχη ην ο λογος, *in the beginning was* " *the Word*; and ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο, *the Word was* " *made flesh*; mean, that the same person, *who, in the* " *fulness of time was made man and dwelt with us,* " did before dwell with God, and acted in the capacity " of a Divine person, as the visible image of the in- " visible God, by whom God made all things, and " by whom all things were from the beginning trans- " acted between God and the creature. But on the " other side, if the word λογος here signifies, λογος " ενδιαθετος, the internal reason or wisdom of the Fa- " ther, which opinion was expressly condemned at " the council of Sirmium, then the words σαρξ " εγενετο, ver. 14. *was made flesh,* can mean only " figuratively, that the wisdom of the Father dwelt " in the man Christ; which is really making him no " other than a mere man." [9]

The Catholic construction of the three first verses of this introduction is to this purpose:—"In the beginning, before the creation of the world, or the first production of any created Being whatever, the Word existed; and the Word was no distant and separate power, estranged from God, or unacquainted with him, but he was originally with God the Father of all, as one brought up with him. Nay, by a generation which none can fully comprehend, the Word was himself God, and possessed of a nature truly and properly divine. And when it pleased the Father to begin the work of creation, all things in the whole compass of nature, were made by this Almighty Word; and without him was not so much as one single Being, whether among the noblest, or

[9] Scripture Doctrine, p. 72, 73.

or the meanest of God's various works, made, that was made."

This is the Catholic interpretation. And that it is the only true one is evident to me from a variety of considerations.

1. From the design of St. John in writing his gospel.

2. From the Logos's being a term in frequent use among the Jews for the second hypostasis in the Divine Nature.

3. From the Heathen and Mahometan application of the Logos of St. John to a person truly divine.

4. From the Christian Fathers having been unanimously of the same opinion.

5. From the Christian church's in all ages and in all countries having been of this opinion.

6. From several of the most learned of our own writers having given the best and most satisfactory reasons for this interpretation.

For all these reasons I conclude, that the Catholic interpretation of these words, is sound, and that Sabellianism, Socinianism, and Arianism, have no countenance from the introduction to St. John's Gospel. [1]

1. From the design of St. John in writing his gospel.

This appears from both Irenæus and Jerome, and also from internal evidence, to have been in opposition to the heresies of Cerinthus and Ebion, who denied the divinity of our blessed Saviour. [2] The testimonies of Irenæus and Jerome we have already produced at the beginning of this enquiry into the meaning of St. John. The internal marks arise from the various terms made

[1] These introductory verses are rescued from the perversions of the Socinians with considerable ability by Dr. Jamieson in his Vindication, book 2. chap. 1.

[2] Consult the very learned Michaelis's Introductory Lectures to the New Testament, sec. 98—105, where there is a particular account of the design of St. John in writing this most invaluable gospel.

use of by the Apostle in this introduction, whereby it appears, that he applies all the leading terms to Christ, which the Cerinthians and other heretics usually applied to their imaginary Æons. "He combined in the per-"son of him, who was *made flesh and dwelt among us* "whatever the earlier Gnostics attributed to the vari-"ous divinities included in their genealogies. In him "the whole Pleroma is contained. He is Μονογενης, "Λογος, Ζωη, Χαρις, Αληθεια. He is moreover the Crea-"tor, the Enlightner, the Saviour of the world: and all "who believe in him, he consecrates the Sons of God, "and raises to the hope of immortal life."[3]

2. From the Logos's being a term in frequent use among the Jews for the second hypostasis in the Divine nature.

This proposition has been proved above, and will be shewed more at large, when we come to treat of the opinions of the ancient Jews in the fifth part of this work, to which I beg leave to refer the serious reader.

3. From the Heathen application of the Logos of St. John to a person truly Divine:

For the proof of this proposition also, the reader is respectfully requested to turn to the sixth part of this work, where the subject is considered more at large, than in the above references.

4. From the Christian fathers having been unanimously of the same opinion.

The truth of this proposition likewise is examined in the seventh part of this work, whither the reader is referred for the proof, besides the quotations we have already produced.

5. From

[3] See a very ingenious and learned discourse by the Rev. Daniel Veysie, preached before the University of Oxford, entitled, "The "Doctrine of St. John, and the Faith of the first Christians, not "Unitarian," p. 27, 28. Dr. Waterland also in his Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 254, &c. has shewn at large how almost every expression in the beginning of this Gospel is pointed against the heretics of those days.

5. From the Christian church's in all ages and in all countries having been of his opinion.

This is confessedly true both of the Greek, the Roman, and the Protestant churches throughout Christendom. There was a temporary exception, indeed, when it was, "Athanasius against the world." But this continued only for a short time, according to the inclination of the reigning princes; and even then there was no dispute concerning the pre-existence of the Son of God.

6. From several of the most learned of our own writers having given the best and most satisfactory reasons for this interpretation.

One of these I will produce somewhat at large, and refer to several others, who have given a similar account of it, in the margin. The one to whom I would particularly call the attention of the reader upon this subject is Archbishop Tillotson. In my judgment he has given a very full and satisfactory view of the Apostle's whole argument.

This Prelate has four learned and ingenious discourses upon our Lord's divinity, which I would earnestly recommend to the repeated perusal of the reader. They have frequently been caviled with and nibbled at by the opposers of that great doctrine, but have never been fairly and honestly answered. That is impossible. They will maintain their ground as long as good sense, just interpretation, sound religion, and the English language, are known among men. As they are not however in every hand, I will present the reader with his general view of this introduction to the gospel of St. John, which is calculated to throw much light upon the whole doctrine of our Saviour's divinity: "I shall consider these two things," says he, "distinct-
"ly and severally, First, the reason of this name or
"title of the WORD, here given by the Evangelist to
"our blessed Saviour. And he seems to have done
"it in compliance with the common way of speaking among

" among the Jews, who frequently called the Messias " by the name of *the Word of the* Lord; of which I " might give many instances: but there is one very re- " markable, in the Targum of Jonathan, which renders " those words of the psalmist, which the Jews acknow- " ledged to be spoken of the Messias, viz. *the* LORD " *said unto my* LORD, *sit thou on my right hand, &c.* I " say it renders them thus, *the* LORD *said unto his Word,* " *sit thou on my right hand, &c.* And so likewise Philo " the Jew calls him *by whom* GOD *made the world, the* " *Word of God,* and *the Son of* GOD. And Plato proba- " bly had the same notion from the Jews, which made " Amelius the Platonist, when he read the beginning " of St. John's gospel, to say, *this Barbarian agrees* " *with Plato, ranking the Word in the order of principles;* " meaning that he made the Word the principle or " efficient cause of the world, as Plato also hath done.

" And this title of the word was so famously known " to be given to the Messias, that even the enemies of " Christianity took notice of it. Julian the apostate " calls Christ by this name: and Mahomet in his alco- " ran gives this name of the Word to Jesus the son of " Mary. But St. John had probably no reference to " Plato, any otherwise than as the Gnosticks, against " whom he wrote, made use of several of Plato's words " and notions. So that in all probability St. John " gives our blessed Saviour this title with regard to the " Jews more especially, who anciently called the Mes- " sias by this name.

2dly. " We will in the next place consider, what " might probably be the occasion why this evangelist " makes so frequent mention of this title of the Word, " and insists so much upon it. And it seems to be " this: nay, I think that hardly any doubt can be made " of it, since the most ancient of the fathers, who lived " nearest the time of St. John, do confirm it to us.

" St. John, who survived all the apostles, lived to " see those heresies which sprang up in the beginning

of

" of Christianity, during the lives of the apostles, " grown up to a great height, to the great prejudice " and disturbance of the Christian religion: I mean " the heresies of Ebion, and Cerinthus, and the sever- " al sects of the Gnosticks which began from Simon " Magus, and were continued and carried on by Valen- " tinus and Basilides, Corpocrates and Menander: some " of which expressly denied the divinity of our Saviour, " asserting him to have been a mere man, and to have " had no manner of existence before he was born of " the blessed Virgin, as Eusebius and Epiphanius tell " us particularly concerning Ebion: which those who " hold the same opinion now in our days, may do well " to consider from whence it had its original.

" Others of them, I still mean the Gnosticks, had " corrupted the simplicity of the Christian doctrine, " by mingling with it the fancies and conceits of the " Jewish cabbalists, and of the schools of Pythagoras " and Plato, and of the Chaldean philosophy, more an- " cient than either; as may be seen in Eusebius *de præ-* " *parat. evang.* and by jumbling all these together they " had framed a confused genealogy of deities, which they " called by several glorious names, and all of them by " the general name of Æons or Ages: among which " they reckoned Ζωὴ, and Λόγος, and Μονογενὴς, and " Πλήρωμα, that is, the Life, and the Word and the " Only-begotten, and the Fulness, and many other " divine powers and emanations which they fancied to " to be successively derived from one another.

" And they also distinguished between the maker of " the world whom they called the God of the old testa- " ment, and the God of the new: and between Jesus " and Christ: Jesus according to the doctrine of Ce- " rinthus, as Irenæus tells us, being the man that was " born of the virgin, and Christ or the Messias, being " that divine power or Spirit which afterwards descend- " ed into Jesus and dwelt in him.

" If it were possible, yet it would be to no purpose,

to

" to go about to reconcile these wild conceits with one " another; and to find out for what reason they were " invented, unless it were to amuse the people with " these *high swelling words of vanity*, and a pretence " of *knowledge falsly so called*, as the apostle speaks in " allusion to the name of Gnosticks, that is to say, the " men of knowledge, which they proudly assumed to " themselves, as if the knowledge of mysteries of a " more sublime nature did peculiarly belong to them.

" In opposition to all these vain and groundless con- " ceits, St. John in the beginning of his gospel chooses " to speak of our blessed Saviour, the history of whose " life and death he was going to write, by the name or " title of the Word, a term very famous among those " sects: and shews that this Word of God, which was " also the title the Jews anciently gave to the Messias, " did exist before he assumed a human nature, and " even from all eternity: and that to this eternal Word " did truly belong all those titles which they kept such " a canting stir about, and which they did with so " much sensless nicety and subtilty distinguish from " one another, as if they had been so many several " emanations from the deity: and he shews that this " Word of God was really and truly the life, and the " light, and the fulness, and the *only-begotten of the Fa-* " *ther*; v. 5 *In him was the life, and the life* " *was the light of men*; and ver. 6. *and the light* " *shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it* " *not:* and ver. 7, 8, 9. where the evangelist speaking " of John the Baptist, says of him, that *he came for a* " *witness, to bear witness of the light*; and that *he was* " *not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that* " *light: and that light was the true light which coming* " *into the world enlightens every man*: and ver. 14. *and* " *we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of* " *the Father, full of grace and truth:* and ver. 16. *And* " *of his fulness we all receive, &c.* You see here is a " perpetual allusion to the glorious titles which they

gave

" gave to their Æons, as if they had been so many " several deities.

" In short, the evangelist shews that all this fanciful " genealogy of divine emanations, with which the Gnos- " ticks made so great a noise, was mere conceit and " imagination; and that all these glorious titles did " really meet in the Messias who is the Word, and who " before his incarnation was from all eternity with God, " partaker of his divine nature and glory.

" I have declared this the more fully and particular- " ly, because the knowledge of it seems to me to be " the only true key to the interpretation of this dis- " course of St. John concerning our Saviour under the " name and title of the Word. And surely it is a quite " wrong way for any man to go about by the mere " strength and subtilty of his reason and wit, though " never so great, to interpret an ancient book, without " understanding and considering the historical occasion " of it, which is the only thing that can give true light " to it.

" And this was the great and fatal mistake of Socinus, " to go to interpret scripture merely by criticising upon " words, and searching into all the senses that they are " possibly capable of, till he can find one, though never " so forced and foreign, that will save harmless the " opinion, which he was before-hand resolved to main- " tain, even against the most natural and obvious sense " of the text which he undertakes to interpret: just as " if a man should interpret ancient statutes and records " by mere critical skill in words, without any re- " gard to the true occasion upon which they were made, " and without any manner of knowledge and insight " into the history of the age in which they were " written."

Such are the reasonings of this learned man upon this introduction to St. John's gospel. To me they are perfectly satisfactory: and, when considered in connection with the great chain of evidence from the beginning

of the world to the present time, they contain an unquestionable proof of the eternal divinity of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. [4]

302.* *Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because* HE KNEW ALL MEN, *and needed not that any should testify of man: for* HE KNEW WHAT WAS IN MAN. John 2. 24, 25.

In this passage the Apostle bears witness to the *omniscience* of his divine Master, which is an attribute peculiar to the Deity.

303.* *Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that* HE WAS COME FROM GOD, *and went to God.* John 13. 3.

In these words St. John declares the pre-existence and omnipotence of Christ: an omnipotence indeed derived from his Father; but this is what all are agreed in; seeing the Son of God confessedly acts by a power derived from his Father, as truly as every earthly offspring acts by a power derived from his earthly parent.

We may observe farther, that this same divine author tells us expressly, that he wrote his gospel in order to prove Jesus to be Christ, and the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name.

304. *Many other signs truly,* says he, *did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing*

[4] For further evidence on this important passage of holy scripture, consult Burnet on the Articles, art. 2. p. 54—56; Bull's Judgment of the Catholic church, c. 2; Grotius, Lightfoot, Hammond, and Whitby on the place. See also Dr. Randolph's Vindication, part 2. p. 23—32. The incomparably learned Bishop Pearson hath vindicated the orthodox interpretation with his usual ability in his Exposition of the Creed, p. 116—119. See likewise Mr. Charles Leslie's unanswerable reasonings on these verses of St. John in his excellent Dialogues on the Socinian Controversy.

believing ye might have life through his name. John 20. 30, 31.

This is a proper close to a book, where the author had first insisted on the personal dignity of the Redeemer, and then confirmed what he had advanced by an induction of particular and supernatural actions, together with a variety of reasonings upon those actions. And, upon the whole, it satisfactorily appears, that the person, of whom the Apostle had been writing, was indeed the true and proper Son of God, who was *in the beginning with God*, and *who was God*, but who, *in the fulness of time*, was made flesh for the redemption of the human race.

PART SECOND.

SECTION XI.

The DIVINITY of Christ argued from some passages in the first Epistle of St. John.

THIS same blessed Apostle begins his first Epistle with a description of the divinity and humanity of Jesus, and ends it with the strongest declaration of his supreme Deity. And all this he does in opposition to the several heresies of the age in which he lived For, it is well known by the learned, there were sor then, who denied the divinity of our Saviour, and or who run into the contrary extreme, and denied h manity. In opposition to which errors, St. J his apostolical authority, asserts both the one other, at the very opening of this divine disc had been peculiarly loved by his master, an a peculiar concern for the honour of his

oe
ners
is hu-
ohn, by
and the
urse. He
l he retained
master. And
as

as he had introduced his gospel with an account of his divine nature, and then proceeded to his incarnation, so here he introduces this epistle with an account of his divinity and humanity jointly:—

305.* *That which was from the beginning, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life; for the Life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us; that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.*

This is a description both of the Saviour's humanity and divinity.[5] *That which was from the beginning—the Word of life—that Eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us*—are all expressions of similar import with several of those in the introduction to his gospel, and are intended to oppose the heresy of those persons, who said Jesus Christ was nothing more than a mere man, and had no existence before he was born of the Virgin. So the expressions—*which we have heard—which we have seen with our eyes—which we have looked upon—and our hands have handled of the* WORD *of life*—are all expressions intended to oppose the heresy of those, who denied his real humanity, and said he had no body, no flesh and blood, but only in appearance.

The

[5] "The holy Apostle plainly censures the same heretics (the "Docetæ, Cerinthians and Ebionites) in this first Epistle also, and "calls them all by that one name of Antichrists, as Irenæus, Ter-"tullian, and others of the ancients have observed." See Bishop Bull's Judgment of the Catholic Church of the three first centuries concerning the necessity of believing, that our Lord Jesus Christ is true God. chap. 2. sect. 5. where there is an admirable illustration of the several phrases in this epistle which allude to the heresies then prevailing in the church. The passage is too long for insertion here, otherwise it would throw much light upon the Apostle's reasoning. Consult too Waterland's Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, chap. 6. p. 262—272, where the design of the whole epistle is well illustrated.

The next place in this epistle, which asserts the divinity of the Son of God, is that in the beginning of the second chapter, where it is said:—

306. *If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.*

Now, though this passage does not say in direct terms, that Jesus is more than man, yet it declares such things of him as cannot be predicated of any mere man. For the atonement for the sins of the world, which Jesus made by the shedding of his blood, and which is so strongly expressed in these words, implies absolutely the super-humanity of our blessed Saviour. Common sense will tell any person, that man cannot atone for man. Hence we find, that all the Socinians, who deny the divinity of Christ, deny the atonement of Christ. For the atonement for sin implies the divinity. If therefore these words assert the doctrine of the atonement, they assert at the same time the doctrine of the divinity. They stand or fall together.[6]

307. *Hereby*

[6] A volume of sermons has lately been published upon the Atonement made by Christ for the sins of mankind by the Rev. Daniel Veysie, which were preached at the Bampton Lecture. In my judgment they are well-reasoned discourses, and perfectly conclusive. The Rev. Caleb Evan's three discourses on the same subject are more popular, and in a strain much more evangelical. I do not recollect to have seen any treatise upon the subject so concise, so scriptural, so satisfactory, and so consolatory, to an awakened mind.

I transcribe here the short view of the doctrine of Atonement which Dr. Samuel Johnson gave to his friend Mr. Boswell:——

"Whatever difficulty there may be in the conception of vicarious "punishments, it is an opinion which had possession of mankind "in all ages. There is no nation that has not used the practice of "sacrifices. Whoever, therefore, denies the propriety of vicarious "punishments, holds an opinion which the sentiments and practice "of mankind have contradicted, from the beginning of the world. "The great sacrifice for the sins of mankind was offered at the "death of the Messiah, who is called in scripture, *The Lamb of "God, that taketh away the sins of the world.* To judge of the

307. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.*[7]

Some copies of this epistle omit the words *of God*, and hence it has been thought that they are an interpolation. Whether this is the case or otherwise I undertake not to determine. It is certain, however, that the context requires the words to make sense of the passage. Nor will any other fill it up with equal propriety.

308. *Hereby*

" reasonableness of the scheme of redemption, it must be considered as necessary to the government of the universe, that God " should make known his perpetual and irreconcileable detestation " of moral evil. He might indeed punish, and punish only the " offenders: but as the end of punishment is not revenge of crimes, " but propagation of virtue, it was more becoming the divine " clemency to find another manner of proceeding, less destructive " to man, and at least equally powerful to promote goodness. The " end of punishment is to reclaim and warn. That punishment " will both reclaim and warn, which shews evidently such abhorrence of sin in God, as may deter us from it, or strike us " with dread of vengeance when we have committed it. This is " effected by vicarious punishments. Nothing could more testify " the opposition between the nature of God and moral evil, or more " amply display his justice, to men and angels, to all orders and " successions of beings, than that it was necessary for the highest " and purest nature, even for DIVINITY itself, to pacify the demands of vengeance, by a painful death; of which the natural " effect will be, that when justice is appeased, there is a proper " place for the exercise of mercy; and that such propitiation shall " supply, in some degree, the imperfections of our obedience, and " the inefficacy of our repentance. For, obedience and repentance, " such as we can perform, are still necessary. Our SAVIOUR has " told us, that he did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil: " to fulfil the typical law, by the performance of what those types " had foreshewn; and the moral law, by precepts of greater " purity and higher exaltation.—The peculiar doctrine of Christianity, is, that of an universal sacrifice, and perpetual propitiation. Other prophets only proclaimed the will and the threatenings of God. Christ satisfied his justice."

Life of Johnson by Boswell, vol. 2. p. 404.

[7] 1 John 3. 16. Consult Burgh's Inquiry for an able defence of this reading, p. 115—119. See Doddridge in loco, where he inclines to reject the common reading.

308. *Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God:*[8] *and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God. And this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world.*

309. *In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.——And the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.*[9]

Where was the extraordinary love of God in sending his Son, if that Son was a mere man like all other men? If such only is their meaning, the scriptures mock and deceive us. But if Jesus is possessed of a divine nature, and was with the Father before the world existed; and if he assumed human nature, and in that nature made a real, full, and proper atonement for the sins of the world, then we may easily discover the love of God to mankind in sending his Son to die, and all those scriptures which speak of God's singular love to his creatures, are easy to be comprehended, and admit of the most reasonable interpretation.

310. *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*[1]

This

[8] 1 John 4. 2, 3. "This language is perfectly proper on the "supposition of Christ's pre-existence; but very improper on the "contrary supposition: for how could a mere man come otherwise "than in the flesh?"

Price's Sermons, p. 136.

[9] 1 John 4. 9, 10, 14.

[1] 1 John 5. 7. "Though we grant this text is not quoted by "the Nicene Council against the Arians, and is not found in many

This declaration is so full and absolute, that I will make

" ancient copies: nay, though we should grant, that it was not " originally in the Epistle of St. John, it is, however, a good " argument for the doctrine of the Trinity. For

" If it was a marginal note, and so crept into the text, this, " however, shows it to have been the opinion of the most ancient " and primitive Chrstians, who put this comment to the text.

" If they say this was put in by the orthodox, it was done in " opposition to heretics; and this was a sufficient evidence of their " firm belief of the doctrine of the Trinity then.

" But if this text was expunged by the Arians, who, as St. " Ambrose observes of them, were remarkable for this sort of " fraudulent dealing with the scriptures, then there was a great deal " of reason for restoring it."

See Fox on the place for the above quotation.

Be it genuine or otherwise, the same sentiment is found in other parts of scripture, and the ancient Christian writers abound with expressions of a similar nature.

The Historians of the martyrdom of Ignatius say:—" Glorify- " ing our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom, and with whom glory " and power be to the Father, with the Holy Ghost, in the holy " church forever and ever. Amen."

Polycarp died expressing his gratitude to God in these words:— " I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, through the eternal " High Priest Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, through whom, to " thee, with him, in the Holy Ghost, be glory both now, and to all " succeeding ages. Amen."

Tertullian has many passages like unto this of St. John:—" I " do testify," says he, " that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, " are undivided one from another." Adv. Prax. cap. 9.

Again:—" Two Gods or two Lords we never have named with " our mouth; not as if the Father were not God, and the Son " God, and the Holy Ghost God, and each of them God." Ibid. cap. 13.

Again:—" I every where hold one substance in three cohering " together." Ibid. cap. 12.

He alludes also to this text when he says:—" These three are " one (essence) not one (person); in like manner as our Lord hath " said, *I and the Father are one* (essence), having regard only to " the unity of substance, not to the singularity of number." Ibid. cap. 25.

St. Cyprian seems to have a full quotation of this text, with very little variation:—" The Lord saith, *I and the Father are one.* " And again concerning the Father, and the Son, and the Holy " Ghost, it is written—*And these three are one.*" De Unit. Ec. liber.

make no comment upon it, but leave the reader to his own reflections. It should seem, if the Father is God, so is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost, and yet they are not three, but one God. And whether the text is genuine or spurious, it is so much in the spirit of several others, that the doctrine of Christ's divinity and the Holy Trinity neither stand nor fall with it.

311.* *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen.*

Such is the conclusion of this most divine Epistle. The author had opened it with a declaration of the Redeemer's compound person, and now he closes all his cautions and observations with another solemn declaration of the real and proper Deity of the Son of God. For the whole context requires that these words

Whoever wishes to see what has been advanced for and against the authenticity of this text may consult Mills, Hammond, Pool, Henry, and Guise in loco. See too Jones on the Trinity, ch. 3. sect. 18. There are various other persons who have written on both sides of this question. The last writers who have embarked in the controversy are Mr. Archdeacon Travis in his Letters to Mr. Gibbon in favour of it, and Messrs. Porson and Marsh against it. Much is to be said on both sides. In point of manuscripts, however, the evidence, I think, is clearly against it. But the context seems to me plainly to want the passage. The evidence of Tertullian and Cyprian too is very considerable. As this is the case, it would be wrong to give up the text, but imprudent to lay any very serious stress upon it, in a controversy of any magnitude.

The reader will find a pretty accurate compendium of the arguments both for and against the authenticity of this warmly contested passage in the notes to the New Testament in Greek and English, printed for Roberts in 1729. The author seems to have been an Arian, and discovers in places great bitterness of spirit against those who differ from him, and therefore should be read with caution, but, upon the whole, it is a work of some ability. He appears to wander far from the truth in his interpretation of some of the prophecies.

should be understood of the Son, rather than of the Father. [2]

PART SECOND.

SECTION XII.

The DIVINITY of Christ argued from some passages in the book of Revelation.

THE book of Revelation is one of the most extraordinary and best authenticated, [3] of all the compositions

[2] 1 John 5. 20, 21. See Whitby on the place, and Bishop Pearson on the Creed, p. 131.—Dr. Doddridge observes upon it, that "It is an argument of the Deity of Christ, which almost all who "have wrote in its defence have urged; and which, I think, none "who have opposed it, have so much as appeared to answer."

Dr. Clarke has treated this text with a great degree of disingenuousness. See his Scripture Doctrine, p. 51, and compare Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 212, and Dr. Randolph's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, part 2. p. 33. See also Fleming's Christology, b. 2. c. 5. p. 201. The learned Doctor appears to disadvantage. Jamieson's Vindication, book 2. chap. 2. sets the doctrine of St. John in this excellent epistle in a just light, in opposition to the Socinians. I repeat again here, that the reader will receive much satisfaction from Waterland's Importance of the doctrine of the Trinity p. 271, 272. See too his Eight Sermons, p. 206—214.—It is the more remarkable that Dr. Clarke should apply this passage to the Father of our Lord, seeing he speaks such strong things of the Deity of the Son in other parts of his writings. In his Reply to the Objections of Robert Nelson, Esq. he saith—"The Son is by communication of divine power and dominion from "the Father, *really and truly God.*" Page 50.—"*He is really and* "*truly God.*" p. 52.—"*The Son is true God*, by communication "of divinity from the Father." p. 62.—"*Christ is by nature truly* "*God; as truly, as man is by nature truly man.*" p. 81. See various other places of the same work to the same purpose. His friend Whiston also, in his Vindication of the Council of Nice, saith, "Jesus Christ is truly God and Lord.—He is a God by nature; "and was such before his incarnation, nay, before the creation of "the world." p. 8.

[3] "The Apocalypse has more human authority than any book

positions in the sacred volume, and is supposed to have been written the last of all, and yet is the most curiously constructed of all. It is composed with more than human skill. It opens with a description of the person of Jesus, in his present glorified humanity, and displays many of the secrets of the invisible world. In the first chapter we have a prayer to the three persons jointly, Father, Spirit, and Son, with an ascription of praise to the Son alone; and then a particular account of the person of that Son, as he appeared to his servant John.

312.* *John to the seven churches which are in Asia; Grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits[4] which are before his throne;*

" of the New Testament besides, even from the time it was de-
" livered." Mr. Joseph Mede, p. 602.

" I do not find any other book of the New Testament so strong-
" ly attested, or commented upon so early as this of the Apoca-
" lypse." Sir Isaac Newton's Observations on Daniel, p. 249. Consult Lardner's Credibility, passim, for its authority.

[4] " By the *Seven Spirits* must be meant one or more persons,
" since he wishes or declares *Grace and Peace* from them. Now
" either this must be meant of Angels, or of the Holy Ghost.
" There are no where prayers made, or blessings given, in the
" name of Angels. This were, indeed, a worshipping them;
" against which there are express authorities, not only in the other
" books of the New Testament, but in this book in particular.
" Nor can it be imagined that Angels would have been named be-
" fore Jesus Christ: So then it remains, that *Seven* being a num-
" ber that imports both variety and perfection, and that was the
" sacred number among the Jews, this is a mystical expression;
" which is no extraordinary thing in a book that is all over mys-
" terious. And it imports one person, from whom all that variety
" of gifts, administrations, and operations that were then in the
" church, did flow: And this is the Holy Ghost. But as to his
" being put in order before Christ, as upon the supposition of an
" equality, the going out of the common order is no great matter;
" so since there was to come after this a full period that concerned
" Christ, it might be a natural way of writing to name him last."
Burnet on the Art. p. 48.

and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first-begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth: Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; TO HIM BE GLORY AND DOMINION FOREVER AND EVER. *Amen.*

After this prayer to the three persons, Father, Son, and Spirit, and ascription of praise to the Son alone, comes in a description of the person of the Judge of the world:—

313.* *Behold, he cometh with clouds: and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him: even so, Amen. I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* BEGINNING *and the* ENDING, *saith the Lord, which* IS, *and which* WAS, *and which* IS TO COME, *the* ALMIGHTY.[s]

Here

[s] Rev. 1. 7. 8. All the Ancients, both before and after the council of Nice, understand this text of God the Son. See Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 227, 228, and Defence of Queries, p. 451. Consult likewise Fiddes's Theol. Spec. vol. 1. p. 397. I will give a specimen here again of the Ancients.

Hermas tells us, that "The name of the Son of God is great and "without bounds, and the whole world is supported by it." Sim. 9. sect. 14.

Barnabas saith, "Christ is Lord of the whole earth." Epist. sect. 5.

Tertullian saith, "Christ is in his own right God Almighty, as "he is the Word of Almighty God." Cont. Prax. c. 17.

Clemens Alexandrinus hath this saying—"He can want nothing, "who hath the Word, the Almighty God.—For the Word is a "possession that has nothing wanting to it." Pædag. c. 7.

Origen hath the following observation:—"That you may know "the *omnipotence* of the Father and the Son to be one and the same "as he is one and the same God and Lord with the Father, hear "John speaking in the Revelation in this manner—These things "saith the Lord God who is, and who was, and who is to come, "the Almighty. For who is the Almighty that is to come, but "Christ?"

De Princip. lib. 1. p. 675.

Here we see, two of the incommunicable perfections of God are expressly applied to the Redeemer of mankind. It will, therefore, follow, that he is, together with his Father, God eternal and omnipotent.

314.* *I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* FIRST *and the* LAST.[6] This is repeated more than once, with some little variation.—*I am the* FIRST *and the* LAST.—*I have the keys of hell and of death.—To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God.—I will give thee a crown of life.—*

These expressions seem to denote, not only the eternity of the Son of God, but that all the invisible world is absolutely under his controul; that he is the Lord of it, killing and making alive at his own pleasure; and that it is his province to reward or doom all the children of men as he judges meet. These appear to be characters infinitely unsuitable to mere glorified humanity.

315.* *All the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reigns and heart.* 2. 23.

If this declaration of our Saviour be compared with what king Solomon says of God—*Thou, even thou* ONLY, *O God, knowest the hearts of all the children of men,* 1 Kings 8. 39—it will follow, that Christ challenges to himself one of the incommunicable properties

[6] Rev. 1. 11. Dr. Doddridge saith on this verse, "That these "titles, Alpha and Omega, first and last, should be repeated so soon, "in a connection which demonstrates they are given to Christ, will "appear very remarkable, whatever sense be given to the eighth "verse. The argument drawn, in the preceding note upon it, "would have been strong, wherever such a passage as this had been "found; but its immediate connection with this, greatly strengthens it. And I cannot forbear recording it, that this text has "done more than any other in the bible, toward preventing me "from giving into that scheme, which would make our Lord Jesus "Christ no more than a deified creature."

ties of the Divine Being. And I think every candid person must allow, that language like the several passages above, very ill becomes the character of any merely human creature.

After the Son of God had thus made his appearance, spoken in the highest stile of Deity, and dictated an epistle to each of the seven churches in Asia, in which these, and various other similar declarations of the Son of God, occur; we are favoured with a view of the heavenly inhabitants; and there we see Jesus seated upon a throne, and receiving from all the angelic world equal honour and praise with his everlasting Father.

316.* *After this I looked, and, behold, a door was opened in heaven,* and I saw what passed there. *And, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne.—And lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a* LAMB, *as it had been slain; and he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the* LAMB, *having every one of them harps, and golden vials, full of odours, which are* THE PRAYERS OF SAINTS.[7] *And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.—And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the* LAMB *that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And*

[7] Here is both worship and prayer offered to the LAMB—the prayers of all the saints.

And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the LAMB *forever and ever.*[8]

Let men in this world treat the Saviour of mankind with what indignity they may, it is evident from these passages, that the angels in heaven are perfectly well acquainted with his nature, and the claims he hath upon their services. ALL THE ANGELS OF GOD WORSHIP HIM! And shall ungrateful man, whom he hath redeemed at the price of his blood, refuse him that honour?

In another part of this extraordinary book, the Lord Jesus is represented as the great Vicegerent of his Father, and heading all the inhabitants of the upper world:—

317.* *I saw heaven opened; and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called, Faithful and True—and his name is called,* THE WORD OF GOD.[9] *And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.—And he had on his vesture, and on his thigh a name written,* KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.[1]

318.* Jesus is called THE GREAT GOD in this same chapter, in conformity with Isaiah's *mighty God*, and St. Paul's *great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*[2]

the

[8] Rev. 4 and 5, passim.

[9] Does not this title, given here to our Saviour, amount to demonstration, that he is the person described in the first chapter of this same author's gospel, under the character of the WORD?

[1] Rev. 19, passim.

[2] Ch. 19. 17. Consult Waterland's Eight Sermons for a vindication of this application, and for the testimonies of the Fathers, p. 214—218.

Soon after this, we find the SON, in common with the FATHER, is spoken of as the TEMPLE of heaven; which, though a mode of speaking highly figurative, is yet ascribing an honour to the Son, which appears incompatible with simple humanity:—

319.* *And an angel talked with me, saying, Come hither, and I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. And he carried me away in the spirit, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem. And I saw* NO TEMPLE *therein: for* THE LORD GOD ALMIGHTY *and the* LAMB *are the* TEMPLE *of it.* 21. 9, 10, 22.

It is further remarkable, that as the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are in common considered as the temple of the heavenly Jerusalem, so the Lamb in common with God is the light of the city:

320.* *The city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of* GOD *did lighten it, and the* LAMB *is the* LIGHT *thereof.* 21. 23.

It may be observed still farther, that by a manner of speaking like unto the two former, if the throne of God is mentioned, so is that of the Lamb; and what is extremely remarkable, is, that GOD and the LAMB are said to have but ONE throne.

321.* *And the angel shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the* THRONE *of* GOD, *and of the* LAMB.—*The* THRONE *of* GOD *and of the* LAMB *shall be in the city.* 22. 1, 3.

322. *The* LORD GOD *of the holy prophets sent* HIS *angel to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done.* 22. 6. Compare this with the sixteenth verse: *I Jesus have sent* MINE ANGEL

to

to testify unto you these things in the churches. The angel that appeared to St. John was the angel of the Lord God, and the Lord God sent him: but he was the angel of Jesus, and Jesus sent him: therefore Jesus is the Lord God of the holy prophets. [3]

This most sublime book shuts up the canon of scripture with several expressions, very unsuitable, as it should seem, to the character of mere glorified humanity, but perfectly consistent and proper, if Jesus is possessed of essential divinity:

323.* *Behold, I come quickly, and* MY *reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.* 22. 12. Here he speaks as the Judge of the world, and the Arbiter of the final fates of men.

324.* *I am* ALPHA *and* OMEGA, *the* BEGINNING *and the* END, *the* FIRST *and the* LAST. 22. 13. Here the Son of God proclaims his own eternity.

325.* *I am the* ROOT *and the* OFFSPRING *of David.* 22. 16. We have noticed this before, as expressive of the Redeemer's pre-existence. As God he was David's Lord, as man David's Son.

326. *I am the* BRIGHT *and* MORNING STAR. 22. 16. I am he that was prophesied of by Balaam as the STAR *which should arise out of Jacob,* Num. 24. 17; and by Malachi, 4. 2. as *the* SUN *of righteousness,* which should enlighten all the ends of the earth.

327.* *Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.* 22. 20. This is a direct prayer to the Saviour of mankind to hasten his coming. The Apostle then closes the whole book with another more indirect one for his readers.

[3] See Jones on the Trinity, p. 5.

328. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.*

We have now gone through the whole bible, and traced the personal character of our blessed Saviour from the beginning of the world to the close of the divine canon. We have seen what were the expectations of mankind before he came—what were his own pretensions, both while he was here upon earth, and after he ascended into heaven—what the declarations of God, of Angels, of Devils, and of Men concerning him, during his abode here below—and what the representations of his Disciples have been since he left our world, when they were under the fullest degree of spiritual illumination. The reader will do himself and the subject the justice to review the whole, and then form his judgment according to evidence.

PART THIRD.

SECTION I.

A view of the doctrine concerning THE HOLY SPIRIT, from the Old Testament.

IN examining the doctrine concerning the HOLY SPIRIT, it will be proper to trace it through the several ages of the world, as we have already done in the former case, because the manifestation grows more clear, as we advance towards the perfection of the Christian dispensation. The bible opens with it.

329.* *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; and the earth was without form and void; and* THE SPIRIT OF GOD *moved* † *upon the face of the waters.* Gen. i. 1, 2.

† Moved upon—מרחפת—*brooded over*, as a hen over her chickens. Milton has given us the exact idea.

" And chiefly, Thou, O SPIRIT, that dost prefer
" Before all temples the upright heart and pure,
" Instruct me, for thou know'st: Thou from the first
" Wast present, and with mighty wings out spread
" Dove-like satt'st brooding on the vast abyss
" And mad'st it pregnant." Book i.

The primitive writers of the Christian church have spoken pretty much at large upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

He is declared by Athenagoras to " proceed from God, and return to God, as a beam proceeds from the sun, and is reflected " back again.—The Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the " Father, by the unity and power of the Holy Ghost." Apol. p. 10.

He is said by Tertullian to be " the third divine person of the " Godhead; the third name of Majesty; the proclaimer of the

From this declaration we learn, that the Holy Spirit

" monarchy of one God; but also, if any will receive the words of " this new prophecy, the interpreter of the dispensation; and the " guide of all truth which is in the Father, and the Son, and the " Holy Ghost, according to the Christian covenant." Adv. Prax. cap. 30.

Again:—" The Son I deduce from no other source than the sub- " stance of the Father; the Spirit I think from no other source " than the Father by the Son." Ibid. cap. 4.

And again:—" The Spirit is the third from the Father and the " Son." Ibid. cap. 8.

Origen says:—" Of the Holy Ghost I conceive that such is his " sanctity, that he cannot be sanctified: for no foreign sanctification " accrues to him from without, nor any, of which he was not before " possessed, accede to him who is always holy, and whose sanctity " never had a beginning. In like manner we must think of the " Father and the Son, for the substance of the Trinity alone is of " its own nature holy, and not by sanctification from without: for " truly it is God alone who is always holy." Homil. 11. in Numb. p. 214.

Gregory Nazianzen shews the sense of the church in his time:— " The Holy Spirit," says he, " always was, and is, and will be. " He had no beginning, nor shall have any end, but is always join- " ed with the Father and the Son, and numbered with them; for it " was not fit either that the Father should ever be without the Son, " or the Son without the Spirit; for that would be the greatest " disgrace to the Deity, that any thing once wanting, should be " added to it:—He was therefore always both with himself, and " with those with whom he is joined, the same, and equal, conceiv- " ing, not conceived, perfecting, not perfected, filling, not filled, " sanctifying, not sanctified, deifying, not deified, invisible, eter- " nal, immense, unchangeable, without quality, quantity, form, tan- " gibility, self-moving, and in eternal motion, independent in his " will, self-powerful, almighty (yet as all things which belong to " the only-begotten Son are referred to the First Cause, so is it " with whatever belong to the Holy Spirit) life, and the giver of " life, light, and the imparter of light, goodness itself, and the " fountain of goodness, the upright, leading, governing, sending, " discerning Spirit, building for himself a temple, preparing the " way, bestowing his favours and working according to his own " will, the Spirit of adoption, truth, wisdom, piety, counsel, for- " titude, fear; by whom the Father is known, and the Son glori- " fied; by which two alone the Father is known. They are of " one rank, one adoration, power, perfection, sanctity. In short: " All things whatsoever which the Father hath, belong to the Son, " excepting that the Son is not unbegotten. And all things which

rit was an agent in the natural, as well as moral creation. For it is evident the expression cannot be unstood of the air or wind, because that element was not as yet separated from the caotic mass. See Mal. 2. 15.

It is remarkable that the ancient Jews understood this of the Spirit of the Messiah. See Gill on the Trinity, p. 27, where he refers to the places. Both the Targum of Jonathan and that of Jerusalem translate this passage, "The Spirit of Mercies from before the Lord."

The next information we meet with concerning this Divine Person, is, not till upwards of fifteen hundred years

"the Son hath belong to the Spirit, except that he is not begotten." Orat. 44. p. 711, 712.

Basil says, "If you are ignorant of many things; nay, if the "things you are ignorant of, be ten thousand times more than those "you know, why should you be ashamed, among so many other "things, to take in this likewise, that safe method of confessing "your ignorance as to the *manner* of the existence of the Holy "Spirit?" Orat. contr. Sabell. p. 608, 609.

In another place he says, "The very motions of our own mind, "whether the soul may be said more properly to create or beget "them; who can exactly determine? What wonder then is it, that "we are not ashamed to confess our ignorance how the Holy Spi"rit was produced? For, that he is superior to created beings, "the things delivered in scripture concerning him do sufficiently "evidence. But the title of *unoriginated*, this no man can be so "absurd as to presume to give to any other than to the Supreme "God: Nay, neither can we give to the HOLY SPIRIT the title "of Son; for there is but one Son of God, even the Only-begot"ten. What title then are we to give the Spirit? We are to call "him the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Truth, "sent forth from God, and bestowed through the Son: not a Ser"vant, but Holy and Good, the directing Spirit, the quickening "Spirit, the Spirit of adoption, the Spirit which knoweth all the "things of God. Neither let any man think, that our refusing to "call the Spirit a Creature, is denying his *personality*. For it is "the part of a pious mind, to be afraid of saying any thing con"cerning the Holy Spirit, which is not revealed in scripture; and "rather be content to wait till the next life, for a perfect knowledge "and understanding of his nature."

Cont. Eunom. lib. 3. p. 85, 86.

years afterwards, when the Almighty is introduced declaring a little before the flood,

330. *My* SPIRIT[5] *shall not always strive with man.* Gen. 6. 3.

About seven hundred years after the flood, and seventeen hundred before the birth of our Saviour, we find that Pharaoh, king of Egypt, had some notion of a Divine Spirit:—

331. *And Pharaoh said unto his servants, Can we find such a one as this is, a man in whom the* SPIRIT[6] OF GOD *is?* Gen. 41. 38.

The author of the book of Job, who is supposed by some to have lived about the time of Pharaoh, tells us, that

332.* *By his* SPIRIT *God garnished the heavens.* Job 26. 13. And,

333.* *The* SPIRIT OF GOD *hath made me, and the* BREATH *of the Almighty hath given me life.*[7] Job 33. 4.

Thes

[5] "The Jews knew the third person in the Trinity by the name "of *Binah* or *Intelligence*, because they thought it was He that "gave men that knowledge of what God was pleased to reveal to "them. In particular, they called him the *Sanctifier*, and the *Fa-*"*ther* of faith; nor is any thing more common among them, "than to give him the name of the *Spirit* of *Holiness*, or the *Holy* "*Spirit*.

Allix's Judgment, p. 173.

[6] "The doctrine of the Spirit of God, is one of those great "heads of gospel truth, wherein the glory of God, and the good "of souls are most eminently concerned. The sending Christ to "redeem us, the sending the Spirit to dwell in us, and to apply that "redemption to us, are the two grand promises of God in the bible, "and the principal objects of our faith and hope."

Hurrion on the Spirit, p. 20.

[7] The book of Judith has a sentiment explanatory of these two passages:—"O God, let all creatures serve thee; for thou spakest "and they were made; thou didst send forth thy SPIRIT and it "created them." Ch. 16. 14.

These two declarations inform us that the Spirit of God was an agent in the original creation of the world, in perfect conformity with Gen. 1. 2. where it is said, *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.* Comp. Mal. 2. 15.

About the same period the Spirit of God was given to Bezaleel, the ingenious artificer.

334. *And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, See, I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah; and I have filled him with the* SPIRIT OF GOD,[s] *in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship,* Exodus 31. 1—3. The same is repeated in chapter 35. 30—35.

It appears from these two passages that the Spirit of God is the proper author of all ingenious arts, and that, if one man excels another, it is because the Divine Spirit has been bestowed upon him for these purposes in a superior degree. Comp. Deut. 8. 18, and Is. 28. 26—29.

Between eight and nine hundred years after the flood, we have an account of the Spirit of God's descending upon the seventy Elders in the camp of Israel:—

335. *And*

Theophilus bishop of Antioch says, "By his WORD and his "WISDOM he founded the universe; for by his WORD and his "SPIRIT the heavens were established."

Theop. ad Autol. lib. 1. p. 74.

[s] What is here attributed to the Spirit of God, is by the Heathen attributed to God himself. Pliny goes to far as to say, "that the "attention which the ancients paid to the invention of arts, and "their kindness in delivering them down to their posterity, is the "gift of God. If any one should suppose that these things could "be found out by the mere force of human genius, he judges of "the gifts of God ungratefully." Lib. 27. c. 1, 2.

Seneca has a sentiment much the same. "Say not that the in-"ventions of men are our own. The principles of all the arts are "planted within us, and God, our great Master, secretly excites "and quickens our geniuses."

De Ben. 4. c. 6.

335. *And Moses went out, and told the people the words of the Lord, and gathered the seventy men of the Elders of the people, and set them round about the tabernacle.* AND THE LORD CAME DOWN IN A CLOUD, *and spake unto him, and took of the* SPIRIT *that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders. And it came to pass that when the* SPIRIT *rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease. But there remained two of the men in the camp—and the* SPIRIT *rested upon them, and they prophesied in the camp.* Num. 11. 24—26.

The Schechinah, or divine Majesty, appeared from heaven in a cloud, and as soon as they received the Spirit they prophesied. See Patrick on the place, where he explains from Maimonides the first and second degrees of prophecy. Compare also Smith's Discourse on Prophecy, published by Patrick.

It was soon after, when the Spirit of God came upon Balaam, and enabled him, not only to say many wonderful things, in a stile more than human, but also to foretel the future fate of kingdoms:—

336. *And when Balaam saw that it pleased the Lord to bless Israel, he went not, as at other times, to seek for enchantments, but he set his face toward the wilderness. And Balaam lifted up his eyes, and he saw Israel abiding in his tents according to their tribes; and the* SPIRIT OF GOD *came upon him.*[9] Numbers 24. 1, 2.

This Spirit, which was bestowed upon him, illuminated his mind with the knowledge of a variety of future events, but does not appear to have effected any moral change upon him. He seems to have lived and died

[9] The Targum of Onkelos has this, "The *Prophetic Spirit* from "the face of the Lord rested upon him."

died in his sins, notwithstanding all his high attainments, and the reputation he had acquired. See Mat. 7. 22, 23.

When the Israelites were in want of a successor to their great leader, the Lord said unto Moses,

337. *Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the* SPIRIT, *and lay thine hand upon him.*[1] Num. 27. 18.

A little above a thousand years before Christ, the Spirit of God manifested himself in an extraordinary manner to Saul and a company of Prophets:—

338. *And the* SPIRIT OF THE LORD *will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man.—And the* SPIRIT OF GOD *came upon Saul and he prophesied among the Prophets.* 1 Sam. 10. 6, 10. See the whole story.

This is a transaction somewhat similar to that on the day of Pentecost described in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

When Nahash the Ammonite proposed ignominious terms of peace to the men of Jabesh-gilead, we are told,

339. *The* SPIRIT OF GOD *came upon Saul when he heard the tidings, and his anger was greatly kindled.*[2] 1 Sam. 11. 6.

[1] How the Heathen came by their information may not be easy to ascertain; but it is certain they abound with sentiments very similar to those we find in the sacred volume. Seneca says, "No man is "good without the assistance of God. Can any one raise himself "superior to the chances of human life, unless aided by the Deity? "It is he who gives magnificent and upright counsels. He dwells "in every good man. If you see a man unalarmed in the midst "of dangers, unpolluted with lust, happy in adversity, calm in "storms, looking down as it were from an eminence upon human "things; don't you hold him in admiration? Don't you say, That "virtue is greater than the little body in which it dwells; the di-"vine power hath descended thither?" Ep. 41.

[2] This sentiment is finely expressed by Cicero in his oration for

The Divine Spirit infused courage, and wisdom, and fortitude into his soul; necessary qualifications in the leader of an army.

340. When this same unhappy king persecuted David, *he fled, and escaped, and came to Samuel in Ramah. —And Saul sent messengers to take David: and when they saw the company of the Prophets prophesying, and Samuel standing as appointed over them, the* SPIRIT OF GOD *was upon the messengers of Saul, and they prophesied. And when it was told Saul, he sent other messengers, and they prophesied likewise. And Saul sent messengers again the third time, and they prophesied also. Then went he also to Ramah—and the* SPIRIT OF GOD *was upon him also, and he went on and prophesied until he came to Ramah. And he stripped off his clothes also, and prophesied before Samuel in like manner; and lay down naked* [3] *all that day and all that night. Wherefore they say, Is Saul also among the prophets?* 1 *Sam.* 19. 18—24.

This was an event extremely remarkable. The hearts of all men are in the hand of God. The day of Pentecost was a repetition of this miraculous transaction.

341. *The*

Sylla, where he openly declares, that the design of saving his country, when Cataline conspired against it, was injected into his mind by the Gods. "O ye immortal Gods," says he, "it was you "who then inflamed my mind with a desire of saving my country. "You called me off from all other thoughts, and turned me to the "salvation of my country alone. You finally brought to my mind "the clearest light amidst the darkest shades of error and ignor- "ance. For I will attribute to you what belongs to you. Nor will "I ascribe so much to my own genius, as that I should of myself "be able to discover what was best to be done in that most unma- "nageable tempest of the republic."

[3] By his laying down naked is only meant, that he stripped off his loose upper garment, which was commonly worn in that country.

341. *The Spirit of the Lord came upon David, and departed from Saul.* 1 Sam. 16. 13, 14.

342.* *The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue: the God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me.* 2 *Sam.* 23, 2, 3. Does it not follow from hence, that the Spirit of the Lord is the God and Rock of Israel?

The Psalms of David were all written several hundreds of years, some upwards of a thousand, before our Saviour. In them there is mention of the Holy Spirit four or five different times: Thus,

343. *Take not thy* HOLY SPIRIT *from me.* 51. 11.

344. *Uphold me with thy free* SPIRIT. 51. 12.

345.* *Thou sendest forth thy* SPIRIT, *they are created.* 104. 30.

346.* *Thy* SPIRIT *is good, lead me.* 143. 10. Dr. Leusden translated this, *Let thy good Spirit lead me*, which is a form of prayer. Ainsworth renders it, *Thy good Spirit shall lead me.* See Patrick in loco.

And in the 139 psalm the same inspired author celebrates the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit:—[4]

347.* *O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my down-sitting, and my up-rising; thou understandest my thoughts afar off. Thou compassest my path and my lying-down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high; I cannot attain unto*

[4] Clemens Alexandrinus says, "There is one Father of the universe, one Logos of the universe, and one Holy Spirit, which "is every where present.

Pædag. l. 1. c. 6.

unto it. Whither shall I go from thy SPIRIT? *or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day; the darkness and the light are both alike to thee. For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb.* Ps. 139. 1—13.

The Spirit of God and the presence of God are the same. Wherever God is, there is also his Spirit.

348. In the time of David it is said, *The* SPIRIT *came upon Amasai.* 1 Chron. 12. 18.

349.* *Then David gave to Solomon—the pattern of all that he had by the* SPIRIT. 1 Chron. 28. 12.

This is an event extremely remarkable. The whole proceedings of David, with regard to building the temple, and all the improvements which he made in the public worship of the Almighty, were suggested to him by the Holy Ghost. The patterns of all the utensils were figured to his mind by this heavenly Suggestor.

If therefore God is immense, so is his Spirit. If God is every where present, so is his Spirit. If God knoweth all things, so doth his Spirit. If God can do all things, so too can his Spirit. And, in short; whatever perfections are in God, the same are also in his Spirit.

In the book of Proverbs we find the Logos promising to pour out his SPIRIT upon all those, who ſhould be obedient to his admonitions:

350. *Wisdom crieth without—How long, ye simple ones, will*

ye

ye love simplicity?—Turn ye at my reproof; behold, I will pour out my SPIRIT *unto you; I will make known* MY *words unto you.* Prov. 1. 20—23.

351. In the time of king Asa it is said, The SPIRIT OF GOD *came unto Azariah the son of Oded.* 2 Chron. 15. 1.

352. Nehemiah saith, *Thou gaveſt thy* GOOD SPIRIT *to inſtruct them.*[s] 9. 20.

353. *Thou testifiedst against them by thy* SPIRIT *in thy prophets.* 9. 30.

The prophets enlarge more upon the office of the HOLY SPIRIT than any of the writers who had gone before them. We will produce their several declarations in order, concerning that blessed person, without attempting at any length to illuſtrate their force and meaning, *comparing* only, as we proceed to the end of the sacred canon, *spiritual things with spiritual.*

354. *Woe to the rebellious children, that cover with a covering, but not of my* SPIRIT. Is. 30. 1.

355. *Because the palaces shall be forsaken—until the* SPIRIT *be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field.* 32. 14, 15.

356. *My mouth it hath commanded, and his* SPIRIT *it hath gathered them.* 34. 16.

357. *Who hath directed the* SPIRIT OF THE LORD, *or being his counsellor hath taught him?* 40. 13. If the reader will consult the context in this place, he will find, that the Spirit is spoken of in the highest stile of Deity, and as the creator of the universe. *Lebanon is not ſufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof ſufficient for a burnt-offering. All the nations before*

[s] Cicero says, "We ought to believe that no man was ever a "good man, without the assistance of God: and no man ever was "a great man without a certain divine inspiration."
De Nat. Deo. l. 2. sect. 165, 166.

before this infinite Spirit *are as nothing, less than nothing, and vanity.*

358. *Behold my servant—I have put* MY SPIRIT *upon him.* 42. 1.

359. *I will pour* MY SPIRIT *upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring.* 44. 3.

360.* *The Lord God and his* SPIRIT *hath sent me.* 48. 16. The Divine Spirit is here spoken of under a personal character, as is frequently the case in the following ages. Whether it was Messiah, or whether it was the prophet himself who spake these words, he declares that he was sent upon his errand to the Jews by the Lord God and *his Spirit.*

361. *This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord,* MY SPIRIT *that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed.* 59. 21.

362. I put together two other remarkable promises of the same Prophet, as being one illustrative of the other. *And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the* SPIRIT *of the Lord shall rest upon him, the* SPIRIT *of wisdom and understanding, the* SPIRIT *of counsel and might, the* SPIRIT *of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.* 11. 1, 2.—The other place is—*The* SPIRIT *of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek.* 61. 1. Compare Luke 4. 18, 19.

363. *They rebelled and vexed his* HOLY SPIRIT. 63. 10. The divine Spirit was the leader of the Israelites through the wilderness.

364. *Where is he that put his* HOLY SPIRIT *within him?* 63. 11.

365.* THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD *caused him to rest.* 63. 14.

By

By comparing these three last passages with the words of Moses, Deut. 32. 12, where it is said, *Jehovah* ALONE *did lead him, and there was no strange god with him*—we shall have a positive proof, that the Holy Spirit is Jehovah. And by carrying the comparison to two other passages in the psalms, the same conclusion will arise: *They provoked the most High in the wilderness, and tempted God in their hearts*—and—*The* HOLY GHOST SAITH, *Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation in the day of temptation in the wilderness, when your fathers tempted* ME. See Ps. 78. 17, 18; Ps. 95. 7, 8; and Heb. 3. 7, 8. This is evidently a divine exhortation to make the Holy Ghost the object of our thanksgiving and praise in common with the Father and Son.

Jeremiah hath but few discoveries of the Holy Spirit; there is one eminent one, however, which is expressly applied to this Divine Agent by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews:

366. *Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt—but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.* Ch. 31. 31—34.

Compare Heb. 8. 7—13; 9. 8; and 10. 15—17, from the two last of which passages it appears, that what is applied to Jehovah by the Prophet is applied to the

the Holy Ghost by the Apostle. Is it not then a legitimate conclusion, that the Holy Ghost of the New Testament is the Jehovah of the Old? Not, surely, to the exclusion of the Father and the Son, but in common with the Father and the Son. The three divine persons are all of equal power, dominion, and glory, yet sustaining different offices in the œconomy of human redemption.

Ezekiel prophesied about 600 years before the birth of Christ. The HOLY SPIRIT is frequently spoken of in his writings. I will not say that every one of the following instances is directly applicable to that divine person, though, I believe, it is generally supposed they are.

367.* *Whither the* SPIRIT *was to go, they went.* 1. 12.

368.* *Whithersoever the* SPIRIT *was to go, they went.* 1. 20.

369. *And the* SPIRIT *entered into me, when he spake unto me.* 2. 2.

370.* *Then the* SPIRIT *took me up, and I heard behind me a voice.* 3. 12.

371.* *Then the* SPIRIT *entered into me, and set me upon my feet.* 3. 24.

372.* *So the* SPIRIT *lifted me up, and took me away.* 3. 14.

373.* *The* SPIRIT *lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem.* 8. 3.

374. *The* SPIRIT *of the living creature was in them.* 10. 17.

375.* *Moreover, the* SPIRIT *lifted me up, and brought me unto the east gate of the Lord's house,—and said unto me, Son of man, these are the men that devise mischief, and give wicked counsel.* 11. 1, 2.

376.* *And the* SPIRIT *of the Lord fell upon me, and said unto me, Speak, Thus saith the Lord.* 11. 5.

377.* *Afterwards*

377.* *Afterwards the* SPIRIT *took me up, and brought me in vision by the* SPIRIT OF GOD *into Chaldea.* 11. 24.

The reader will observe upon these several declarations of Ezekiel, that in most of them the Divine Spirit is spoken of under a personal character, and as a personal agent. This is more fully explained in the New Testament; especially in the Acts of the Apostles.

378. *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put* MY SPIRIT *within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them.* 36. 25—27.

All the moral changes, which are wrought in the minds of men, are effected by the influence of the Holy Ghost alone. The Father sustains his peculiar office in the redemption of mankind, the Son his, and the Spirit his. All three concur in every act of redeeming power and love, but yet each hath a department in the business, which is appropriated to him alone. It is remarkable, however, that there are places in scripture where every office is ascribed to every person.

379. *Ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened your graves—and shall put* MY SPIRIT *in you, and ye shall live.* 37. 12, 13.

It is not improbable but the Spirit in this, and some few other places, may signify nothing more than the breath of man. The context must determine the signification. It is well known, that the word for Spirit, both in the Hebrew and Greek languages, is frequently used in both senses.

380. *I have poured out* MY SPIRIT *upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God.* 39. 29.

381. *Daniel, in whom is the* SPIRIT *of the holy Gods.* Ch. 4. 8.

382. *There is a man in thy kingdom, in whom is the* SPIRIT *of the holy Gods.* ch. 5. 11.

383. *I have heard that the* SPIRIT *of the Gods is in thee.* ch. 5. 14.

It appears from these three passages that a notion of a divine spirit prevailed among the nations of the East. The wisest of the Heathens, indeed, were strongly persuaded of the divine agency upon the mind of man, not only in the eaſtern, but also in the western parts of the world. "Whatsoever good you do," said Bias, "think "that you receive it from God."—Timoleon was of opinion that "nothing is done among men without "the divine aid."—"There is no good mind without "God," says Seneca. "If any man is possessed of an "excellent and moderate mind; if any man laughs at "what other mortals fear and wish for; a divine power "actuates and governs such an one. Such a frame "of mind could not be attained without the assistance "of the Deity." Ep. 73.

384. *The prophet is a fool, the man of the* SPIRIT *is mad.* Hos. 9. 7.

The operations of the Holy Spirit were matters of jeſt and ridicule in former times, as well as in the present day.

385. *I will pour out my* SPIRIT *upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.* Joel 2. 28.

386. *In those days will I pour out my* SPIRIT. ch. 2. 29.

It is sufficiently evident from these two promises, that the minds of men were never intended by the Almighty to be fully enlightened with the knowledge of the great truths of religion, till these latter ages.

387. *My*

387. *My* SPIRIT *remaineth among you: fear ye not.* Hag. 2. 5.

The Holy Spirit, in all his prophetic influences, was with-drawn from the people, within a few years after this declaration, and appeared not again till the days of John the Baptist; a period of about four hundred years. It should seem, however, that when this Divine Spirit was with-drawn from the Jews, it was more copiously bestowed upon the Gentiles. It is certain, at least, that no period of the ancient world ever produced so large a number of rare geniuses as were raised up among the Greeks and Romans during a few of the centuries before the birth of Jesus Christ.

388. *This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my* SPIRIT, *saith the Lord of hosts.* Zec. 4. 6.

389. *They made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in his* SPIRIT *by the former prophets.* 7. 12.

390. *I will pour upon the house of David—the* SPIRIT *of grace and supplication.* 12. 10: Or a gracious, melting, penitential spirit, of which the Holy Ghost should be the author.

391. *Yet had he the residue of the* SPIRIT.[6] Mal. 2. 15. This is a proof extremely satisfactory, that the Spirit of God was concerned in the first creation of the world.

[6] It is not the intention of this work to enter into a particular discussion of the various doctrines concerning the Divine Spirit, but only to exhibit to the reader at one view the true scripture principles, leaving him to form his own judgment. If he wishes to consider the subject more at large, he will receive all the satisfaction he can reasonably expect from Dr. Owen's very valuable Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit, which is a large and scarce work. Mr. Burders's Abridgment will answer almost every purpose of the original, and may be purchased for a few shillings. Hurrion's Scripture

These are the principal, if not all the passages where the Holy Spirit is mentioned in the Old Testament. We will now proceed to the New, and advance through the several books in order, making such observations as we go along, as may seem necessary to draw the attention of the reader to the true meaning of the Spirit in these invaluable writings.

PART THIRD.

SECTION II.

A view of the doctrine concerning THE HOLY SPIRIT, from the New Testament.

THE existence, personality, office, and divinity of the Holy Spirit seem to me to be established with accumulated evidence from these writings of the Old Testament which we have already surveyed: but the strongest and most satisfactory proofs of these several particulars arise from the writings of the new covenant dispensation. To these we will now therefore turn our attention, as we have before done on the enquiry concerning the personal character of the Son of God and Saviour of men.

392. *Before*

Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in sixteen Sermons is an admirable volume. Dr. Ridley's Sermons on the Holy Spirit at Lady Moyer's Lectures, is said to be worthy the attention of the theological student, but I have not been able to meet with it. To these may be added Mr. Hawker's eight Sermons on the Divinity and Operations of the Holy Ghost; Dr. Scott's View of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the third volume of his Christian Life; but above all Bishop Pearson on the Creed, where, on the eighth article, he has defended the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, with his usual learning and ability, against every material objection of the Socinians.

392. *Before they came together she was found with child of the* HOLY GHOST.[7] Mat. 1. 18.

393. *That which is conceived in her is of the* HOLY GHOST. 1. 20.

The Holy Spirit was not only engaged in the original formation of the world, but he was also the sole former of the body of Jesus in the womb of the Virgin, as well as the sole regenerator of the souls of men in every age.

394. *He shall baptize you with the* HOLY GHOST *and with*

[7] "Christ is born," says the eloquent Nazianzen, "the Spirit "is his forerunner; Christ is baptized, the Spirit bears witness; "Christ is tempted, the Spirit leads him away; Christ works mira- "cles, the Spirit works with him; Christ ascends, the Spirit suc- "ceeds. What is so great and godlike which he cannot do? What "name is so divine, that of unbegotten and begotten excepted, by "which he may not be called?—He is called the Spirit of God, "the Spirit of Christ, the mind of Christ, the Spirit of the Lord, "himself being Lord, the Spirit of adoption, the Spirit of truth, "the Spirit of liberty, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, "the Spirit of counsel and strength, the Spirit of knowledge, of "piety, and of the fear of God. And as the efficient cause of all "these, he fills all things with his essence; contains all things; "the world is filled with his presence; and he is himself greater "than that the world can contain his power and energy. He is "good, righteous, princely by nature, not by donation. He sanc- "tifies, is not sanctified; he measures, is not measured; he gives, "but does not receive; he fills, but is not filled; he contains, is not "contained; he is numbered, glorified, rightfully inherits with the "Father and the Son. Being the finger of God, as a consuming "fire, he denounces wrath, to shew that he is of the same essence. "The same Spirit who was the maker, recreates by baptism and "the resurrection. The Spirit knows and teaches all things; blows "where he will, and as much as he will, going before, speaking, "sending, and recalling. He is angered, tempted, reveals, and "withdraws light and life; nay he is light and life itself. He "builds temples and dwells in them as God.—He does all things "as God himself does. He appeared as cloven tongues of fire. "He distributes his gifts; made apostles, prophets, evangelists, "pastors and teachers.—He is almighty, all-seeing, penetrating into "all spirits, at the same moment of time, though far separated from "each other."

Orat. 37. vol. 1. p. 610.

with fire. 3. 11. The Spirit shall purify the souls of men, as metal is purified by the action of fire.

395.* *He saw the* SPIRIT *of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him.* 3. 16. Behold here a personal appearance of the Spirit, distinct from the Father, and the Son.

396. *Then was Jesus led up of the* SPIRIT *into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil.* 4. 1: By a strong impulse upon his mind.

397. *I will put my* SPIRIT *upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles.* 12. 18.

398. *If I cast out devils by the* SPIRIT *of God.* 12. 28. Christ wrought all his mighty works by the power of the Spirit. The Spirit, therefore, is omnipotent.

399. *The blasphemy against the* HOLY SPIRIT *shall not be forgiven unto men.* 12. 31.

400. *Whosoever speaketh against the* HOLY GHOST *it shall not be forgiven him.* 12. 32. The sin against the Holy Ghost seems to be irremissable beyond every other, because it is rejecting the last and only efficacious means appointed of heaven for the salvation of souls.

401. *How then doth David in* SPIRIT *call him Lord?* 22. 43. This is agreeable to the sentiment of St. Paul—*No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* 1 Cor. 12. 3.

402. *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the* FATHER, *and of the* SON, *and of the* HOLY GHOST. 28. 19. The whole Christian world is here commanded, by the Redeemer himself, to be dedicated to the service of the Holy Ghost, in common with the Father and the Son.

403. *He shall baptize you with the* HOLY GHOST. Mark 1. 8.

404. *He saw the heavens opened, and the* SPIRIT *like a dove descending upon him.* 1. 10. 405. *The*

405. *The* SPIRIT *driveth him into the wilderness.* 1. 12.

406. *David said by the* HOLY GHOST, *The Lord said to my Lord.* 12. 36. David was under the influence of the Divine Spirit, not only when he settled the temple worship, but also when he composed his sacred hymns. Compare 2 Sam. 23. 2, 3; and 1 Chron. 28. 12.

407. *It is not ye that speak, but the* HOLY GHOST. 13. 11.

408. *He shall be filled with the* HOLY GHOST *even from his mother's womb.* Luke 1. 15.

409. *The* HOLY GHOST *shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* 1. 35.

410. *Elizabeth was filled with the* HOLY GHOST. 1. 41.

411. *His father Zacharias was filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *and prophesied.* 1. 67.

412. *And the* HOLY GHOST *was upon him.* 2. 25.

413. *It was revealed unto him by the* HOLY GHOST, *that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ.* 2. 26.

414. *He came by the* SPIRIT *into the temple.* 2. 27.

415.* *And the* HOLY GHOST *descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him.* 3. 22.

416. *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.* 3. 16.

417. *Jesus being full of the* HOLY GHOST *returned from Jordan, and was led by the* SPIRIT *into the wilderness.* 4. 1.

418. *Jesus returned in the power of the* SPIRIT *into Galilee.* 4. 14.

419. *The* SPIRIT *of the Lord is upon me.* 4. 18.

420. *How much more shall your heavenly Father give the* HOLY SPIRIT *to them that ask him?* 11. 13.

421. *Unto him that blasphemeth against the* HOLY GHOST *it shall not be forgiven.* 12. 10.

422. *The* HOLY GHOST *shall teach you in the same hour what*

what ye ought to say. 12. 12. Could an unintelligent agent be capable of teaching man wisdom?

423. *Behold I send the* PROMISE *of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.* 24. 49.

424.* *John bare record, saying, I saw the* SPIRIT *descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.* John 1. 32.

425. *Upon whom thou shalt see the* SPIRIT *descending and remaining on him, the same is he who baptizeth with the* HOLY GHOST. 1. 33. Here is a distinct personal agency.

426. *Except a man be born of water and of the* SPIRIT, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* 3. 5.

427. *That which is born of the* SPIRIT *is spirit.* 3. 6. To be born of the Spirit, and to be born of God, is the same thing, therefore the Spirit is God. Compare John 1. 13.

428. *So is every one that is born of the* SPIRIT. 3. 8.

429. *God giveth not the* SPIRIT *by measure unto him.* 3. 34.

430. *This spake he of the* SPIRIT, *which they that believe on him should receive; for the* HOLY GHOST *was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.* 7. 39.

431.* *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another* COMFORTER, *that he may abide with you forever; even the* SPIRIT *of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.* 14. 16, 17.

432.* *The* COMFORTER,[8] *which is the* HOLY GHOST, *whom*

[8] Dr. Owen, in his excellent book on the Spirit, illustrates the personality of the Holy Ghost, as taught in scripture, by a pertinent similitude. "It is impossible," says he, "to prove the Father to "be a person, or the Son to be a person, any other way than we "may prove the Holy Ghost to be so. For he to whom all per-"sonal properties, attributes, adjuncts, and operations are ascribed;

whom the Father will send in my name; he shall
W w *teach*

" and to whom nothing is ascribed but what prop-ly belongs to a " person, he is a person; and so are we taught to believe him to be. " Thus we know the Father to be a person, and the Son also; for " our knowledge of things is more by their properties, than by their " essential forms.—There is no personal property belonging to the " Divine Nature, that is not in one place of scripture or other " ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

" If a wise and honest man should come and tell you, that in a " certain country where he has been, there is an excellent Govern- " or, who wisely discharges the duties of his office; who hears " causes, discerns right, distributes justice, relieves the poor, and " comforts the distressed; would you not believe that he intended " by this description a righteous, wise, diligent, intelligent PERSON? " What else could any man living imagine?

" But now suppose that a stranger, or person of suspicious " character and credit, should come and say, that the former in- " formation which you had received was indeed true, but that no " *man* or *person* was intended, but the *sun*, or the *wind*, which, " by their benign influences, rendered the country fruitful and tem- " perate, and disposed the inhabitants to mutual kindness and be- " nignity; and therefore, that the whole description of a *governor* " and his *actions*, was merely *figurative*, though no such intimation " had been given you. Must you not conclude, either that the " first person was a notorious trifler, and designed your ruin, if " your affairs depended on his report; or that your latter informer " whose veracity you had reason to suspect, had endeavoured to " abuse both him and you. It is exactly thus in the case before us. " The scripture tells, that the Holy Ghost governs the church; " appoints overseers of it; discerns and judges all things; com- " forts the faint; strengthens the weak; is grieved and provoked " by sin; and that in these, and many other affairs, he works, " orders and disposes all things, according to the counsel of his own " will. Can any man credit this testimony, and conceive otherwise " of the Spirit, than as a holy, wise, intelligent *person?* Now while " we are under the power of these apprehensions, there come to us " some men, *Socinians* or *Quakers*, whom we have just cause to " suspect of deceit and falsehood; and they tell us, that what the " scripture says of the Holy Ghost is indeed *true*, but that *no such* " *person* is intended by these expressions, but only an *accident*, a " *quality*, an *effect*, or *influence* of the power of God, which doth " all these things *figuratively*; that he has a *will* figuratively, an " *understanding* figuratively, is *sinned against* figuratively; and so " of all that is said of him. Now what can any man, not bereft of " natural reason as well as spiritual light, conclude? but either " that the scripture designed to draw him into fatal errors, or that

teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you. 14. 26.

433.* *When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the* SPIRIT *of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* 15. 26.

434.* *I tell you the truth: It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the* COMFORTER *will not come unto you: but if I depart I will send him unto you: and when he is come, he shall reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.* 16. 7, 8.

435.* *When he, the* SPIRIT *of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shew it unto you.* 16. 13—15.

Language is incapable of expreſſing the perſonal exiſtence of the Holy Spirit in more forcible terms than these. If he is not a distinct, personal and intelligent agent, expreſſions have no meaning.

436. *He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the* HOLY GHOST. 20. 22. This is an emblimatical action, such as were common among the Jews.

The evidence to the existence, personal properties, intelligence, and deity of the Holy Spirit, are pretty numerous

" those who impose such a sense upon it, are corrupt seducers, who " would rob him of his faith and comforts? Such will they at last " appear to be."

Burder's Abridgment, p. 28, 29.

merous and strong from the four goſpels. The Acts of the Apostles abound still more with the same kind of information.

437. *After that he, through the* HOLY GHOST, *had given commandment unto the Apostle.* Acts 1. 2.
438. *Wait for the* PROMISE *of the Father.* 1. 4.
439. *Baptized with the* HOLY GHOST *not many days hence.* 1. 5.
440. *Ye shall receive power after that the* HOLY GHOST *is come upon you.* 1. 8.
441. *Which the* HOLY GHOST, *by the mouth of David spake before.* 1. 16.
442. *And they were all filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *and began to speak with other tongues as the* SPIRIT *gave them utterance.* 2. 4.
443. *It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my* SPIRIT *upon all flesh.* 2. 17.
444. *I will pour out in those days of my* SPIRIT. 2. 18.
445. *Being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the* HOLY GHOST, *he hath shed forth this.* 2. 33.
446. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remiſſion of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the* HOLY GHOST: *for the promise is to you, and to your children.* 2. 38, 39.
447. *Peter, filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *said.* 4. 8.
448. *And they were all filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *and they spake the word of God with boldness.* 4. 31.
449.* *Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the* HOLY GHOST? *Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.*[9] 5. 3, 4.
450. *To tempt the* SPIRIT *of the Lord?* 5. 9.
451. *We are witnesses of these things, and so is also the* HOLY GHOST, *whom God hath given to them that obey him.* 5. 32.

 452. *Men*

[9] Lying to the Holy Ghost, is lying unto God; therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

452. *Men of honest report, full of the* HOLY GHOST, *and wisdom.* 6. 3.

453. *Stephen, a man full of faith and the* HOLY GHOST. 6. 5.

454. *Ye do always resist the* HOLY GHOST. 7. 51.

455. *He being full of the* HOLY GHOST *looked up stedfastly into heaven.* 7. 55.

456. *Prayed for them that they might receive the* HOLY GHOST. 8. 15.

457. *Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the* HOLY GHOST. 8. 17.

458. *When Simon saw, that through laying on the Apostles hands, the* HOLY GHOST *was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the* HOLY GHOST. 8. 18, 19.

459.* *Then the* SPIRIT *said unto Philip, Go near and join thyself to this chariot.* 8. 29. Here the Spirit is introduced as a personal, and intelligent agent.[1]

460.* *The* SPIRIT *of the Lord caught away Philip.* 8. 39. We see again, that as the Spirit had before spoken

[1] St. Cyprian has summed up the several operations of the Holy Spirit in a manner worthy of our attention:—"All," says he, "is "by the guidance of the Holy Spirit that those who wandered are "directed, the wicked are converted, the weak are strengthened. "He, the right Spirit, the Holy Spirit, the princely Spirit, rules, "perfects, dwells in our souls, which he perfects, and our hearts "which he possesses. Nor does he suffer those to err, or be cor-"rupted, or overcome whom he hath taught, whom he hath pos-"sessed, and whom he hath girded with the sword of most power-"ful virtue.—

"He washes away sins; he justifies the ungodly, and calls the "dead to life; he heals discord, and draws and binds with the bond "of love; he raises us up to heaven; and, freeing us from the "vanities of this world, he makes us heirs of a kingdom above; "of which this is the chief happiness, that this body by spiritual "influences converses with angels; nor shall there be any more "the appetites of flesh and blood; but there shall be a full sufficiency of all things; God shall be known, and the Holy Spirit shall "dwell within us."

De Spirit. Sancto, p. 486, 488.

spoken to Philip, so here he bore him miraculously away; a sufficient proof of his personal agency.

461. *Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the* HOLY GHOST. 9. 17.

462. *Then had the churches rest—and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the* HOLY GHOST, *were multiplied.* 9. 31.

463.* *While Peter thought on the vision, the* SPIRIT *said unto him, Behold three men seek thee.* 10. 19.

464.* *Go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them.* 10. 20. In both these cases the Spirit is introduced as speaking to Peter in the manner of a personal agent.

465. *God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the* HOLY GHOST *and with power.* 10. 38.

466. *The* HOLY GHOST *fell on all them who heard the word.* 10. 44.

467. *On the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the* HOLY GHOST. 10. 45.

468. *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the* HOLY GHOST, *as well as we?* 10. 47.

469.* *And the* SPIRIT *bade me go with them, nothing doubting.* 11. 12. Here again the Spirit speaks, and in such a manner as implies that he is the governor of the church.

470. *As I began to speak, the* HOLY GHOST *fell on them, as on us at the beginning.* 11. 15.

471. *John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the* HOLY GHOST. 11. 16.

472. *God gave them the like gift (of the* HOLY GHOST.) 11. 17.

473. *Barnabas was a good man, and full of the* HOLY GHOST *and of faith.* 11. 24.

474. *Agabus*

474. *Agabus ſignified by the* SPIRIT *great dearth.* 11 28.

475*. *As they miniſtered to the Lord and faſted, the* HOLY GHOST *ſaid, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.* 13. 2. Hence it appears the Spirit acts as a ſovereign in the church, and the context ſhews the Apoſtles obeyed his orders.

476.* *They, being ſent forth by the* HOLY GHOST, *departed unto Seleucia.* 13. 4. The whole of the goſpel diſpenſation, and government of the church, is in the hands of the Spirit.

477. *Then Saul,—filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *ſet his eyes on him.* 13. 9.

478. *The diſciples were filled with joy, and with the* HOLY GHOST. 13. 52.

479. *God, who knoweth the hearts, bare them witneſs, giving them the* HOLY GHOST, *even as he did unto us.* 15. 8.

480*. *It ſeemed good to the* HOLY GHOST *and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than theſe neceſſary things.* 15. 28. Behold here again the perſonal and intellectual agency of the Spirit.

481*. *When they had gone throughout Phrygia,—and were forbidden of the* HOLY GHOST *to preach the word in Aſia, after they were come to Myſia, they aſſayed to go into Bithynia; but the* SPIRIT *ſuffered them not.* 16. 6, 7. The ſame obſervation holds good here. The Holy Spirit acts as a ſovereign.

482. *For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain alſo of your own poets have ſaid, For we are alſo his offſpring.* 17. 28.

This paſſage is much in the ſpirit of the hundred and and thirty ninth pſalm. And as that pſalm is applied to the Spirit of God which filleth all things, ſo may this verſe be applied to the ſame divine perſon. The poet to which the Apoſtle refers was Aratus, who lived about the

the year 280 before Christ. The poem quoted begins in the manner following:—

" From Jove begin: let not us men
" Permit great Jove to be unsung.
" For every town, and every crowd
" Of living men, with Jove are fill'd.
" With him are fill'd both sea and land.
" Of Jove we're every where possess'd.
" For we, even we his offspring are,
" Kindly he points out good to all."*

483. *Have ye received the* HOLY GHOST *since ye believed? And they say unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any* HOLY GHOST. 19. 2. It had never come to our knowledge that the Holy Spirit had been given in any extraordinary manner.

484. *When Paul had laid his hands on them, the* HOLY GHOST *came on them.* 19. 6.

485.* *Save that the* HOLY GHOST *witnesseth in every city, saying, that bonds and afflictions abide me.* 20. 23. The Spirit speaks to Paul.

486.* *Take heed—to all the flock over the which the* HOLY GHOST *hath made you overseers.* 20. 28. The Holy Spirit appoints all ministers in the church.

487. *They said to Paul through the* SPIRIT, *that he should not go up to Jerusalem.* 21. 4.[2]

* Compare with this the hymns of Cleanthes and Eupolis to the Creator.

[2] The doctrine of the Holy Spirit's influence upon the human mind is treated with great and general neglect in the present day. This, I conceive to be the chief cause of that lukewarmness and irreligion which prevail in so fatal a degree among all ranks of men. A most able and animated defence of these divine influences hath lately been laid before the public by the Rev. Dr. Knox, in his Christian Philosophy; a work which has a strong tendency to revive the dying cause of religion, and to distinguish between what is spurious and what is genuine among the professors of Christianity. In my judgment, however, the learned Doctor makes too little account of external evidence. If he could see it right to rectify this part in the next edition, I make no doubt the volumes would become very generally acceptable to men of inquiring minds.

488.* *He took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the* HOLY GHOST, *So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle.* 21. 11. The Holy Ghost speaks to Agabus.

489.* *Well spake the* HOLY GHOST *by Isaiah the prophet unto our fathers, saying; Go unto this people, and say,* &c.—*and I should heal them.* 28. 25—27. See Jones on the Trinity upon this passage, ch. 2. sect. 22, where he proves by a comparison of it with the sixth chapter of Isaiah, that the HOLY GHOST is the LORD OF HOSTS.

The Acts of the Apostles, we have seen, abounds largely with declarations concerning the Holy Spirit. The evidence from thence will be found perfectly decisive for his existence, personality, intelligence, and divinity. The Epistles come next under consideration.

490. *Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the* SPIRIT OF HOLINESS. Rom. 1. 4. The Spirit of holineſs probably means in this place the Divine Nature of Jesus. The expression is ambiguous.

491. *The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the* HOLY GHOST *which is given unto us.* 5. 5.

492. *Who walk not after the flesh, but after the* SPIRIT. 8. 1.

493. *The law of the* SPIRIT *of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free.* 8. 2.

494. *Who walk not after the flesh, but after the* SPIRIT. 8. 4.

495. *They that are after the* SPIRIT *do mind the things of the* SPIRIT. 8. 5.

496. *Ye are not in the flesh, but in the* SPIRIT, *if so be that the* SPIRIT *of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the* SPIRIT *of Christ he is none of his.*

his. 8. 9. The Holy Ghost is equally the Spirit of God and of Christ.

497. *The* SPIRIT *is life because of righteousness.* 8. 10.

498.* *If the* SPIRIT *of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his* SPIRIT *that dwelleth in you.* 8. 11.

The Spirit of God was the agent in raising up the body of Jesus Christ from the grave, and will be the same in the resurrection of our bodies. It is remarkable, however, that all the three persons are spoken of as being concerned both in the resurrection of Jesus and in our resurrection.

499. *If ye through the* SPIRIT *do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.* 8. 13.

500. *As many as are led by the* SPIRIT *of God they are the sons of God.* 8. 14.

501. *Ye have received the* SPIRIT *of adoption.* 8. 15.

502.* *The* SPIRIT *itself beareth witness with our spirit.* 8. 16.

503. *Who have the first-fruits of the* SPIRIT. 8. 23.

504. *The* SPIRIT *helpeth our infirmities.* 8. 26.

505.* *The* SPIRIT *itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.* 8. 26. Here is also personal agency.

506. *He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the* SPIRIT. 8. 27.

507.* *My conscience bearing me witness in the* HOLY GHOST. 9. 1. Here is an appeal to the Holy Ghost, which appeal was never to be made to any other being but God by the law. Deut. 6. 13, 14. The Holy Ghost therefore is God.

508. *The kingdom of God is—joy in the* HOLY GHOST. 14. 17.

509. *Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace*

in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the HOLY GHOST. 15. 13.

510. *That the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the* HOLY GHOST. 15. 16.

511. *Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the* SPIRIT OF GOD. 15. 19.

All the miracles wrought by the Apostles were accomplished by the power of the Spirit. Indeed, there is that intercommunity, if I may so speak, between the Father, Son, and Spirit, that they all concur in every act of creation, providence, and grace.

512. *I beseech you—for the love of the* SPIRIT. 15. 30.

513. *My preaching was in demonstration of the* SPIRIT, *and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.* 1 Cor. 2. 4, 5. Hence it appears the Spirit is God.

514.* *The things which God hath prepared for them that love him, God hath revealed unto us by his* SPIRIT: *for the* SPIRIT *searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.* 2. 9, 10.

515.* *The things of God, knoweth no man, but the* SPIRIT OF GOD. 2. 11.

If the Holy Ghost is capable of searching the counsels of the Divine mind, and of knowing all the secrets of God as fully as the spirit of a man knows all the secrets of his own bosom, he must be commensurate with that Infinite Being, and consequently must be infinite himself.

516. *We have received the* SPIRIT *which is of God, that we might know the things which are freely given to us of God.* 2. 12.

517. *In words which the* HOLY GHOST *teacheth.* 2. 13.

518. *The natural man receiveth not the things of the* SPIRIT OF GOD. 2. 14.

519.* *Know*

519.[a] *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the* SPIRIT OF GOD *dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.*[1] 3. 16, 17. The Holy Ghost is called God three times in these two verses.

520. *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the* SPIRIT *of our God.* 6. 11.

521. *Know ye not that your body is the temple of the* HOLY GHOST, *which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God*[b] *in your*

[1] St. Ambrose says, when speaking of this passage, "How impudently do you deny the deity of the Holy Spirit, when you "read, that the Spirit hath a temple; for it is written, *Ye are the "temple of God, and the Holy Spirit dwells in you.* God therefore "hath a temple: a creature hath no real temple: but the Spirit "hath a temple; for he dwelleth in you." De Spiritu Sancto, lib. 3. c. 13.

Theophylact upon it says, "If we be the temple of God, be"cause the Spirit of God dwells in us, then the Spirit is God."

"In this place," says Calvin, "we have a clear testimony, "asserting the divinity of the Holy Spirit: for if he was a crea"ture, or a gift only, he would not have made them the temple of "God, by dwelling in them."

Bishop Pearson says, "We know no other reason why we are the "temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwells in us, but only "because the Spirit of God is God." On the Creed, p. 320.

The same learned man says again: "That person whose inhabi"tation makes a temple, is God; for if the notion of a temple be "nothing else but to be the house of God, and if to be the house "of any creature is not to be a temple, as it is not, then no inhabi"tation of any created person can make a temple; but the inha"bitation of the Holy Ghost makes a temple:—therefore the Holy "Ghost is God."

P. 319.

[b] "The Jewish temple, to which there seems here to be an allu"sion, was a place of the most solemn religious worship of that "God to which the temple was built and dedicated. Believers be"ing the temple of the Holy Ghost, are bound to worship him, "whose temple they are."

Hurrion, p. 142.

body, and in your spirit, which are God's. 6. 19, 20. Compare this with 2 Cor. 6. 16. *Ye are the temple of the* LIVING GOD; *as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.* And with Levit. 26. 11, 12. *I will set my tabernacle amongst you; and my soul shall not abhor you. And I will walk among you and will be your God, and ye shall be my people.* To be the temple of the Holy Ghost, and the temple of the living God, is one and the same thing; the Holy Ghost therefore is the living God.

522. *I think also that I have the* SPIRIT OF GOD. 7. 40.

523. *No man speaking by the* SPIRIT OF GOD *calleth Jesus accursed: and no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the* HOLY GHOST. 12. 3.

524. *There are diversities of gifts, but the same* SPIRIT. 12. 4.

525.* *The manifestation of the* SPIRIT *is given to every man to profit withal: for to one is given by the* SPIRIT *the word of wisdom: to another, the word of knowledge by the same* SPIRIT: *to another, faith by the same* SPIRIT: *to another, the gifts of healing by the same* SPIRIT. *But all these worketh that one and the self-same* SPIRIT, *dividing to every one severally as* HE WILL.[s] 12. 7, 8, 9, 11.

527.* *By*

[s] St. Chrysostom observes on these words, "*As he will*, it is "said, not as he is commanded; dividing, not as divided, he being "the author, not subject to authority. Do you not see the perfect "power? for they who have the same nature, no doubt, have the "same authority; and they that have the same dignity, have one "and the same virtue and power."

Irenæus in his short view of a Christian's belief says:—"In one "God, the Supreme Governor over all, of whom are all things; "—and in the Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom are "are all things;—and in the Spirit of God, which hath in every "generation manifested unto men the dispensations both of the Fa-"ther and the Son, according to the will of the Father." Lib. 4. cap. 62.

526. *By one* SPIRIT *we are all baptized into one body—and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.* 12. 13.

527. *In the* SPIRIT *he speaketh mysteries.* 14. 2.

528. *Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the* SPIRIT *in our hearts.* 2 Cor. 1. 22.

529. *Ye are the epistle of Christ, written, not with ink, but with the* SPIRIT *of the living God.* 3. 3. Compare Heb. 8. 10.

530. *How shall not the ministration of the* SPIRIT *be rather glorious?* 3. 8.

531. *Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.* 3. 17.

532. *Changed from glory to glory, even as by the* SPIRIT *of the Lord.*[6] 3. 18. or *by the Lord the Spirit,* as it is in the original.

533. *God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the* SPIRIT. 5. 5.

534. *By the* HOLY GHOST. 6. 6. Dr. Harwood would "render this, "By a devout disposition, or virtuous temper." Vide his Greek Test. in loco.

535. *Ye are the temple of the* LIVING GOD. 6. 16. Or of the HOLY GHOST. 1. Cor. 6. 19.

536. *If ye receive another* SPIRIT, *which ye have not received.* 11. 4.

537. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and* THE COMMUNION OF THE HOLY GHOST *be with you all. Amen.*[7] 13. 14.

This

"The Spirit is not without the Word," says Athanasius, "but "being in the Word, it is through him in God: so that all gifts "are given by the three persons. For in the distribution of gifts, "as the Apostle writeth to the Corinthians, it is the same Spirit, "it is the same Lord, and it is the same God, which worketh all "in all. For the Father himself, through the Word, in the Spirit, "worketh and giveth all things."

Ep. 1. ad Serap. de Spiritu Sancto.

[6] Dr. Clarke explains this whole chapter in a different manner. See his Commentary on 40 select texts of scripture, p. 192—206.

[7] Origen says, "As for us, who worship and adore no creature,

This is a prayer to the three persons of the Divine Nature for their respective blessings in the covenant of redemption. And as the communications of the Holy Spirit are essentially necessary to our holiness and happiness, those communications are supplicated for the believers of Corinth by the affectionate Apostle.

538. *Received ye the* SPIRIT *by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?* Gal. 3. 2.
539. *Are ye so foolish? having begun in the* SPIRIT, *are ye now made perfect by the flesh?* 3. 3.
540. *He therefore that ministereth to you the* SPIRIT. 3. 5.
541. *That we might receive the promise of the* SPIRIT *through faith.* 3. 14.
542. *Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the* SPIRIT *of his Son into your hearts.* 4. 6.
543. *Persecuted him that was born after the* SPIRIT. 4. 29.
544. *We through the* SPIRIT *wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.* 5. 5.
545. *Walk in the* SPIRIT. 5. 16.
546. *The flesh lusteth against the* SPIRIT, *and the* SPIRIT *against the flesh.* 5. 17.
547. *If ye be led by the* SPIRIT, *ye are not under the law.* 5. 18.
548. *The fruit of the* SPIRIT *is love, joy, peace.* 5. 22.
549. *If we live in the* SPIRIT, *let us also walk in the* SPIRIT. 5. 25.
550. *He that soweth to the* SPIRIT, *shall of the* SPIRIT *reap life everlasting.* 6. 8.
551. *In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the* HOLY SPIRIT *of promise.* Ep. 1. 13.
552. *That the Father of glory may give you the* SPIRIT *of wisdom and understanding.* 1. 17.

553.* *Through*

" but the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as we do not err in " our worship, so neither let us offend in our actions and conver- " sation."

In Epist. ad Rom. lib. 1.

553.* *Through him we both have access by one* SPIRIT *unto the Father.* 2. 18.

554.* *An habitation of God through the* SPIRIT. 2. 18. God dwells in all true believers by his Spirit.

555. *As it is now revealed unto the holy Apostles and Prophets by the* SPIRIT. 3. 5.

556. *Strengthened with might by his* SPIRIT *in the inner man.* 3. 16.

557. *Keep the unity of the* SPIRIT *in the bond of peace.* 4. 3.

558. *There is one body, and one* SPIRIT. 4. 4.

559. *Grieve not the* HOLY SPIRIT *of God, whereby ye are sealed.* 4. 30.

560. *The fruit of the* SPIRIT *is in all goodness, righteousness, and truth.*[s] 5. 9.

561. *Be filled with the* SPIRIT. 5. 18.

562. *Take the sword of the* SPIRIT. 6. 17.

563. *Praying—with all supplication in the* SPIRIT. 6. 18.

564. *The supply of the* SPIRIT *of Jesus Christ.* Phil. 1. 19.

565. *If any fellowship of the* SPIRIT. 2. 1.

566.* *Which worship God in the* SPIRIT.[s] 3. 3. This should be translated *God the Spirit.* See Hurrion, p. 143, 144. Ambrose understands it in the same manner. And indeed the literal rendering is unquestionably *God the Spirit.*

567. *Our gospel came—in power, and in the* HOLY GHOST. 1 Thes. 1. 5.

568. *With joy of the* HOLY GHOST. 1. 6.

569. *God, who hath also given unto us his* HOLY SPIRIT. 4. 8.

570. *Quench not the* SPIRIT. 5. 19.

571. *God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the* SPIRIT, *and belief of the truth.* 2 Thes. 2. 13.

572. *The*

[s] Cicero says, "If intelligence, virtue, fidelity, and harmony, "are found in the human race; from whence could they flow down "upon earth, unless from the Supreme Being?

De Nat. Deo. l. 2. n. 97.

572. *The* LORD [9] *direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.* 2 Thes. 3. 5.

Here the Lord prayed to, is the Spirit, in express distinction from God the Father, and from Jesus Christ; for the Apostle prays to this Lord to direct their hearts into the love of God; this is the work of the Spirit; and also to cause them patiently to wait for Christ; and this also is the work of the Spirit. The Spirit, therefore, is that Lord to whom he prayed. See Hurrion, p. 51.

573.* *The* LORD *make you to encrease and abound in love one towards another, to the end he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before* GOD *even our* FATHER *at the coming of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST. 1 Thes. 3. 12, 13.

Here again the Lord spoken of is distinguished from the

[9] The reason why the Holy Spirit is not so fully and frequently addressed by prayer and praise as the Father and the Son is well expressed by Hurrion; I will therefore give it in his own words:—"As Christ came not," says this excellent man, "to glorify himself, but the Father, so the Spirit came not to glorify himself, but Christ; as our Saviour teaches us in these words;—*He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: he shall glorify me; for he shall take of mine, and shew it to you.* John 16. 13, 14. When Christ came in the flesh, he veiled his own glory, and proclaimed the Father's: so the Holy Spirit, as it were, conceals his own glory, to promote the glory of Christ, in whose name he both speaks and acts. But yet as Christ sometimes turned aside the veil, and manifested his own glory, so the Holy Spirit sometimes, in the scriptures, discovers his own glory, though not so frequently, so clearly, and so fully, as that of the Son.—The design of his mission was to glorify the Son, not himself; and as Christ was no less God, and no less worthy of glory, when he humbled himself, than when he was exalted; so the Holy Ghost is no less worthy of glory, when he comes to reveal the glory of Christ, than if he had come more fully to display his own."

Page 182.

the Father and the Son: for he is to establish the heart before the Father, and at the coming of Christ. He therefore is a third person whose work it is to sanctify and establish the saints. [1]

574.* *Now* GOD HIMSELF, *and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you.* 3. 11. Here the Holy Ghost is named first, and is expressly called GOD HIMSELF. [2] St. Clement,

[1] Polycarp concluded his last prayer at the stake in these words: "I praise thee for all things; I bless thee, I glorify thee with the "eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, with whom, "to thee, and the Holy Spirit, be glory both now, and unto future "ages."

Justin Martyr also declares in his first Apology for the Christians, in vindication of them from the charge of atheism, that "they "worshipped and adored the Father, the Son, and the prophetic "Spirit."

St. Cyprian:—"O thou Divine Spirit, be thou present, and from "heaven shed down thy consolation on those that wait for thee. "Sanctify the temple of our body, and consecrate it a habitation "for thyself. Make those souls joyful with thy presence, who de-"sire thee. Render the house worthy of thee, the inhabitant. "Adorn thy secret recess, and surround the place of thy rest with "a variety of virtues. Strow the pavement with ornaments; let thy "mansion shine with the brightness of carbuncles and precious "stones; and let the odours of all thy gifts send from within a "sweet perfume. Let thy fragment balsam abundantly per-"fume thy residence, and expel whatever is noisome, and the spring "of corruption. Do thou make this our joy, stable and lasting: "and this renovation of thy creature do thou continue eternally in "unfading beauty." De Spiritu Sanct. p. 484, 485.

St. Chrysostom says, "Adore the Holy Spirit, whom you have "received. Say often that you are well rewarded; Christ has "taken thy flesh, and given thee his Spirit. This the saving law "suggests, the prophets speak, the apostles in their divine oracles "declare, the martyrs confess, the godly believe, the church con-"sents to; ignorance opposes, the faithful are persuaded of by "many arguments; and thus Christ is glorified; for his is the "glory, and honour, and adoration, together with the Father, and "the most holy and quickening Spirit, now, and ever, and for ages "of ages. Amen."

Hom. de Spirit. Sanct. vol. 6. p. 191. Ed. Franc.

[2] That this is the proper meaning of the passage, see Hawker's Sermons on the Spirit, p. 267.

speaking of the Spirit of the Lord, and his searching the heart, says, "It is better to offend the "foolish and proud men, than God."[3]

575. *God—was justified in the* SPIRIT. 1 Tim. 3. 16.

576.* *Now the* SPIRIT *speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith.*[4] 4. 1.

577. *In charity, in* SPIRIT, *in faith.* 4. 12.

578. *The* SPIRIT—*of power, and of love.* 2 Tim. 1. 7.

579. *That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the* HOLY GHOST *which dwelleth in us.* 2 Tim. 1. 14.

580. *He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the* HOLY GHOST; *which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.* Titus 3. 5, 6.

581. *God bearing them witness—with gifts of the* HOLY GHOST. Heb. 2. 4.

582. *Wherefore as the* HOLY GHOST *saith, To day if ye will hear his voice.* 3. 7.

What the Apostle applies here to the Holy Ghost, is applied by the Psalmist to Jehovah our Maker. The Divine Spirit, in common with the Father and the Son, is therefore the Lord our Maker. Compare Ex. 17. 2. with

[3] Epist. 1. sect. 21.

[4] Mr. Hawker sums up the evidence of the Spirit's personality in these words:—"He is said to *create and give life*; to *uphold*, and, "by taking away the breath of his creatures, to *destroy*: he is said "also, to *teach*; and to *guide into all truth*: he was seen *in a bodily* "*shape like a dove*: he hath *spoken expressly*: by *prophets*: to *apos-* "*tles*: and to *churches*: he hath appointed *ministers*: sent *messen-* "*gers*: hath borne *witness*: hath been appealed to *as* a *witness*: "hath *testified of Christ*: he is described as possessing all *personal* "properties, such as *joy*, and *grief*: a *mind*: a *will*: and *power*: "is declared capable of being *tempted*: of being *resisted*: of hav- "ing *despite* done unto him: and of being *blasphemed*; all which, "more or less, must be allowed to be very highly demonstrative of "personal consciousness and identity."

Sermons, p. 168, 169.

with this declaration of the Apostle, and the whole ninety fifth psalm. See too Hurrion, p. 141.

583. *Were made partakers of the* HOLY GHOST. 6. 4.
584.* THE HOLY GHOST *this signifying.* 9. 8.

It appears from the context on this passage, that St. Paul considered the Holy Spirit as the author of the whole Mosaic œconomy. Comp. Heb. 10. 15, and 1 Chron. 28. 12.

585. *Christ, who through the* ETERNAL SPIRIT *offered himself without spot to God.* 9. 14.

Origen says, "I believe that there is one God, the "creator and maker of all things; and that the Word, "which came forth from him, is God also, of one sub-"stance with the Father, and eternally existent; and "that in these latter times he took manhood of Mary. "I believe also in the Holy Ghost, who is eternally "existent. Cont. Marcion. sect. 1.

586. THE HOLY GHOST *also is a witness to us.* 10. 15.
587. *Hath done despite to the* SPIRIT *of grace.* 10. 29.
588.* *Elect—through sanctification of the* SPIRIT. 1 Pet. 1. 2.
589. *Searching what, or what manner of time the* SPIRIT *of Christ which was in them did signify.* 1. 11. The Spirit of Christ it was who inspired all the prophets of the Old Testament.
590. *With the* HOLY GHOST *sent down from heaven, which things the angels desire to look into.* 1. 12.

What was there so extraordinary for the angels to be so eager to dive into, if the Holy Spirit is nothing more than the influence of God upon the mind? But if that Holy Being is what we suppose him to be, there is just ground for wonder.

591. *Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the* SPIRIT. 1. 22.
592. *Put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the* SPIRIT. 3. 18.
593. *The* SPIRIT *of glory and of God resteth upon you.* 4. 14. The glorious Spirit of God.
594. *Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the* HOLY GHOST. 2 Pet. 1. 21.

Compare this with 2 Tim. 3. 16. *All scripture is given by inspiration of God.* And Heb. 1. 1. GOD *who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets.* From hence will it not appear that the Holy Ghost is the God who spake?

595. *Ye have an unction from the* HOLY ONE, *and ye know all things.* 1 John, 2. 20.
596. *The* ANOINTING *which ye have received of him abideth in you.* 2. 27.
597. *Hereby we know that he abideth in us by the* SPIRIT *which he hath given us.* 3. 24.
598. *Hereby know ye the* SPIRIT OF GOD. 4. 2.
599. *He hath given us of his* SPIRIT. 4. 13.
600. *It is the* SPIRIT *that beareth witness, because the* SPIRIT *is truth.* 5. 6.
601. *There are three that bear record in heaven; the* FATHER, *the* WORD, *and the* HOLY GHOST: *and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth; the* SPIRIT, *and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.*[s] 5. 7, 8.

601. *Sensual*

[s] It is pretty generally understood that the former part of this passage is thought by some to be an interpolation. But let it be determined as it may, with respect to the former part of the passage, the latter part is received as unquestionable by all; and this, as well as the other, is thought by some to hold out the doctrine of the three persons in the Divine Nature. St. Augustine saith, the *Spirit* here signifies the *Father*, the *Water* signifies the *Holy Ghost*, and the *Blood* represents the *Son*. See Peter Martyr's Common Places, part 1. chap. 12, p. 105.

602. *Sensual, having not the* SPIRIT. Jude 19.
603. *Praying in the* HOLY GHOST. 20.
604. *The* SEVEN SPIRITS *which are before his throne.* Rev. 1. 4.

Dr. Lightfoot says, "John terms the Holy Ghost the "seven spirits according to the Jews common speech, "who speak much of the seven spirits of the Messiah." And Witsius well observes that "the seven spirits are "never said to worship God, as the elders and living "creatures do; but on the contrary are invoked by "John; which honour belongs not to created spirits; "and that John invokes them in the same manner and "with the same worship as he gives to the Father and "the Son, as the author with the Father and Son, of "grace and peace, without any note of discrimination."
Exercit. de Spirit. Sanct. p. 428.

This is a clear instance of prayer to the three Divine Persons, the Father, the Spirit, and the Son. Consult Hurrion on this place, who is particularly satisfactory. p. 152—156.

605. *I was in the* SPIRIT *on the Lord's day.* 1. 10.
606. *Let him hear what the* SPIRIT *saith unto the churches.* 2. 7. This is seven times repeated in the second and third chapters.
607. *Immediately I was in the* SPIRIT. 4. 2.
608. *I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the* SEVEN SPIRITS *of God sent forth into all the earth.* 5. 6.

609. *Blessed*

Mr. Wakefield considers the passage as a proof of our blessed Saviour's real dissolution: The spirit, the water, and the blood all concurring to prove the certainty of his death. But then he would translate spirit, breath. His *breath* was gone, *blood* and *water* issued from the pericardium, when the spear pierced his side, and therefore no doubt can remain but he was actually in the state of the dead. See this Gentleman's Evidences of Christianity, Remark 43. p. 227.

609. *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord—Yea, saith the* SPIRIT; *that they may rest from their labours.* 14. 13.
610. *He carried me away in the* SIPRIT. 17. 3.
611. *The testimony of Jesus is the* SPIRIT *of prophecy.* 19. 10.
612. *He carried me away in the* SPIRIT *to a great mountain.* 21. 10.
613. *The* SPIRIT *and the bride say, Come.* 22. 7.

This is the account which the bible gives us of the person and operations of the Holy Spirit; from all which it appears, that he is mentioned upwards of three hundred times in the two testaments—that he was in the beginning engaged with God in the creation of the natural world—that he hath a real, true, and personal existence—that he is omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, and eternal in his nature—that he is equally the Spirit of God and of Christ, and proceedeth both from one and the other—that he is essentially God, and to be worshipped by every human creature, who believeth in the name of Jesus—that it was he who led the Israelites, and gave them rest after their forty years travel in the wilderness—that to lie unto him is the same as lying unto God—that blasphemy against him is a sin never to be forgiven, either in this world, or in the world to come—that if we are to be baptized in the name of the Father and Son, so also in the name of the Holy Ghost—that if we are to be blessed in the name of the Father and Son, so also in the name of the Holy Ghost—that if the Father and the Son bear record, so also doth the Holy Ghost—that he alone it was who formed the body of Jesus in the womb of Mary—that he conducted Christ in all the actions of his life—endued him with more than human wisdom and knowledge—enabled him to work miracles at his own pleasure—and finally raised him from the dead, as he will also be the agent in raising the bodies of the whole human

human race at the last day—that it is he who striveth with the hearts of men, illuminating, convincing, reproving, restraining, and drawing us from sin and folly to wisdom, piety, and truth—that it is he too who dwells in the hearts of his faithful servants, as in a temple, claiming our obedience and adoration—that all the qualifications of the Apostles and Evangelists for the great work in which they were engaged were from him—that he enlightened, roused, warmed, and fortified their minds, enabling them to speak strange languages, to work wonders in confirmation of the doctrines which they taught, to foretel future events, to speak with wisdom and courage before kings, and to confirm their testimony in every way that was suitable with the divine understanding—that this same blessed Spirit is also the inspirer of all ingenious arts and inventions, the reviver of the languishing powers of nature, and the infuser of courage and fortitude into the minds of men:—that he is the author of all moral and religious excellency, grace, wisdom, knowledge, goodness, piety, truth, patience, long-suffering, forbearance, righteousness, love, peace, joy, consolation, hope, trust, and whatever else can make us holy and happy here, and prepare us for glory and felicity hereafter—that the Prophets and Apostles spake only as they were moved by him; and to him alone we are indebted for all their invaluable writings—that, finally, it is his particular office to reveal Christ to our minds, and that no man can properly and savingly say, that Jesus is the Lord, but by a power derived from him.

PART FOURTH.

SECTION I.

A view of the doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY from the Old Testament.

WE lay this down as a first principle, agreed upon by all sects and denominations of Christians throughout the world, that there is none other God but one.

Let us now examine the holy scriptures, and see how this one God hath spoken of himself in the several ages of the world. He must certainly be the best judge in what manner to speak of his own adorable nature. And as he hath spoken of himself, so ought we to speak likewise. Indeed, we have no right to speak of him otherwise.[6] To begin with Genesis:

614.* *In*

[6] "Why do we assert three persons in the Godhead? Not because "we find them in the Athanasian creed, but because the scripture hath "revealed that there are *Three, Father, Son,* and *Holy Ghost,* to "whom the Divine Nature and Attributes are given. This we "verily believe that the scripture hath revealed, and that there are "a great many places, of which, we think no tolerable sense can "be given without it; and therefore we assert this doctrine on the "same grounds on which we believe the scriptures. And if there "are three Persons which have the Divine Nature attributed to "them; what must we do in this case? Must we cast off the Unity "of the Divine Essence? No; that is too frequently and plainly "asserted for us to call it in question. Must we reject those scrip-"tures which attribute Divinity to the Son and Holy Ghost, as well "as to the Father? That we cannot do, unless we cast off those "books of scripture, wherein those things are contained." Stilling-fleet on the Trinity, p. 112.

Dr. Isaac Barrow, one of the first of Christians and Scholars, says; "That there is one Divine nature or essence, common unto "three persons incomprehensibly united, and ineffably distinguish-"ed; united in essential attributes, distinguished by peculiar idioms "and relations; all equally infinite in every divine perfection, each

614.* *In the beginning* GOD[7] *created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the* SPIRIT[8] *of God moved upon the face of the waters.*

Now this passage of sacred writ, as well as many others, contains some important information in the original language which does not appear in our translation. For it is very remarkable, that the Hebrew word, which

" different from other in order and manner of subsistence; that " there is a mutual inexistence of one in all, and all in one; a com- " munication without any deprivation or diminution in the Com- " municant; an eternal generation, and an eternal procession with- " out precedence or succession, without proper causality or depen- " dence; a Father imparting his own, and the Son receiving his " Father's life, and a Spirit issuing from both, without any division " or multiplication of essence; these are notions which may well " puzzle our reason in conceiving how they agree, but should not " stagger our faith in assenting that they are true; upon which we " should mediate, not with hope to comprehend, but with disposi- " tion to admire, veiling our faces in the presence, and prostrating " our reason at the feet of wisdom so far transcending us." Defence of the Trinity, p. 7, 8.

The doctrine of the Trinity has been a bone of contention among men for many ages. Whoever wishes to see the progress of the controversy may read Dr. Berriman's Historical Account of it, in eight Sermons at Lady Moyer's Lecture.

[7] אלהים. The ancient Jews understood this word as conveying the idea of a plurality in the Godhead. " Come," says one of them, " see the mystery of the word *Elohim:* there are three de- " grees, and every degree by itself alone, and yet, notwithstanding, " they are all one, and joined together in one, and are not divided " one from another." Rabbi Simeon Ben Jochai, in Zoar, upon the sixth section of Leviticus. See Ainsworth's Annotations on the place.

[8] It has been observed by several of the Christian Fathers, that in these two verses, the three persons in the blessed TRINITY are plainly distinguished, the first in the word *God*, the second in the word *Beginning* or *Principle*, the third in the words *Spirit of God*. See Bibliotheca Biblica, on the place, and Fleming's Christology, vol. 1. p. 276.

we render GOD, is used in the plural number.' Is it not

[9] R. Bechai, a celebrated author among the Jews, discoursing of the word Elohim, and of the import and signification of it, adds these words—*According to the Cabbalistical way this name Elohim is two words*, namely, *El him*, that is, *They are God. But the explanation of the Jod is to be fetched from Eccles.* 12. 1. *Remember thy* CREATORS. *He that is prudent will understand it.*—These words do sufficiently prove the Cabbala among the Jews, that though the Divine Nature was but *one*, yet there was some kind of *plurality* in this Divine Nature: and this is fairly insinuated in the *Bera Elohim*, which we find in the beginning of Genesis.*

R. Huna is introduced in a Jewish work as saying, that if this kind of language had not been written, it would not have been lawful to say, *The Elohim hath created*, &c.§

Likewise the Jewish Rabbi, Limborch tells us, that in the word ELOHIM there are three degrees, each distinct by itself, yet all *one*, joined in *one*, and not divided from one another. Leslie's Short Method with Deists and Jews.

It is clear too, how sensible the Jews have been, that there is a notion of *plurality* plainly imported in the Hebrew text, since they have forbidden their common people the reading of the history of the creation, lest understanding it literally, it should lead them into heresy. Allix, p. 132.

The degrees in the Divine Nature are called by the cabbalistic doctors the *Panim*, or Faces; the *Havioth*, or Subsistences, and the *Prosopin*, or Persons.

It may be observed here likewise that the Hebrew doctors always supposed the first verse of Genesis to contain some latent mystery. The Rabbi Ibba indeed expressly says it does, and adds, "This "mystery is not to be revealed till the coming of the Messiah."

It is worth observing too, that the ancient Jews, not chusing to use the singular name *Jehovah*, have substituted for it *Adonai*, a noun in the plural signifying *My Lords*. See Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 473, 474.

In the beginning God created, is, by the Jerusalem Targum, rendered, "By his Wisdom God created." This is in conformity with the words of Solomon, where he says, *The Lord by* WISDOM *hath founded the earth, by* UNDERSTANDING *hath he established the heavens*. Prov. 3. 1. The book of Wisdom too says, "Give me "WISDOM that sitteth by thy throne." Ch. 9. 4. And in the 17 verse of the same chapter the author of that book says again, "Thy council who hath known, except thou give WISDOM and "send thy HOLY SPIRIT from above." This is agreeable to the notions of the ancient Jews, who usually called the second number in the Divine essence WISDOM, and the third UNDERSTANDING. Irenæus seems to have had the same ideas when he said, "The Fa-

*Kidder's Demonstration, part 3. p. 81.---§ Martini Pugio Fidei, p. 388.

not extraordinary, that Moses, the man of God, who was above all things careful to guard his people against every species of idolatry, should in the very beginning of, and all the way through, his Law, make use of a word for the name of God, which led them to think of a *plurality*, when the language afforded other words in the singular number that would have answered his purpose equally well? What might be his reason? Upon the supposition of a *plurality* of persons in the Divine Nature, it is easily accounted for; but, not, I think, in a satisfactory manner,[1] upon any other. And it appears from several of the Jewish writings, which are not contained in the bible, that they did actually understand the hints, interspersed in the books of Moses, as conveying the idea of a *plurality* in the Supreme Being.[2] If it be inquired of what persons this *plurality* consists? Two are most evidently mentioned in the context, namely, the FATHER and the HOLY SPIRIT. And the work of creation is frequently, in the New Testament, at least, ascribed to JESUS CHRIST. Therefore, here are three persons, namely, the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, most evidently concerned in the original creation of the world.[3] And when

"THER has ever with him his WORD and WISDOM, his SON and "SPIRIT, by whom and in whom he made all things freely." Lib. 4. c. 20. And in another place the WORD and WISDOM, the SON and SPIRIT, are called the HANDS of God by which he made the world. See the same book and chapter. This idea was common both among the ancient Jews and Christian fathers. See Bishop Horsley's Tracts, p. 47, &c.

[1] See Maurice's History of Indostan, vol. 1. page 72.

[2] John Xeres, a Jew converted here in England some years ago, published a sensible and affectionate address to his unbelieving brethren, wherein he says, that "the word *Elohim*, which is rendered "God in Gen. 1. 1. is of the plural number, though annexed to "a verb of the singular number; which," says he, "demonstrates "as evidently as may be, that there are several persons partaking of "the same divine nature and essence."

Jones on the Trin. chap. 3. sect. 1.

[3] Irenæus is exactly of the same opinion:—"The FATHER," says he, "made all things, visible and invisible, not by angels, nor

Moses made use of a plural noun for the name of God, which he does *thirty* times in the short history of the creation, and, perhaps, *five hundred* times more in one form or other in the five books of his writings, this, I apprehend, was the idea he meant to convey to mankind. He meant, or rather the HOLY SPIRIT, by whom he was inspired to write his history, meant, to give some hints and intimations of a doctrine more clearly to be revealed in future ages.[4] This has been the divine conduct from the beginning.

When God had nearly gone through the six days creation, and was come to the formation of the human species, he changes his manner of speaking, and says, not, Let man be, as before; nor, I will make man; but,

Let

" by any powers separated from his own mind; for the God of all " stands in need of nothing; but, by his own WORD and SPIRIT, " makes, governs, and gives being to all things."

Lib. 1. cap. 22. sect. 1.

[4] This sentiment may, perhaps, be further corroberated by an observation which the Rabbins have made on the verb בָּרָא, the second word in the Hebrew bible, which is in the third person singular, though joined with a nominative case in the third person plural. The letters of this word are supposed by them to express these three characters, the SON, the SPIRIT, and the FATHER. Thus ב is the initial letter of בֵּן the SON; ר the initial letter of רוּחַ the SPIRIT; and א the initial letter of אַב the FATHER.

See the Rev. Dr. Bayley's Sermon on the Trinity, p. 8. and Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 535.

The *Triangle* in Egypt was of old considered as a just symbol of the *threefold* Deity; and in the celebrated Jewish book called Zohar the *three* branches of the Hebrew letter *Schin* are asserted to be a proper emblem of the *three* persons that compose the Divine essence. Sometimes the Jews have called these three persons three *Spirits*; at other times three *Powers*; and at other times three *Lights*. It may be observed, moreover, that the Jews had several other symbolical representations of the Trinity besides the Hebrew *Schin*. There was the three *Jods* and the *Chametz* in a circle; the three *Rays* in form of a crown; the *Sphere* with three hands; the *Cherubim*; and some others. For a particular account of which consult Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4.

615.* *Let* US *make man, in* OUR *image after* OUR *likeness.*[5]

Let us[6] —plainly implying, or rather, plainly expressing

[5] The Jews tell us, that when Moses was writing the six days works, and came to this verse, he made a stop, and said, "Lord of "the world, why wilt thou give an occasion to heretics to open their "mouths against the truth?" They add also that God replied to Moses, "Write on; he that will err, let him err." Bereshit Rabba, Parash. 8. See also Patrick on the place, and Maimonides's More Nevochim, par. 2. cap. 29.

This fabulous story was invented on purpose by the Jews to defend themselves against the Christians, who from the beginning contended for a plurality in the Godhead founded on this text. It shews in a very strong light the opinion the Jews had of the force of this and such like passages. Philo, the learned Jew, says, that "the words, *Let us make man*, signify plurality." Page 312, Paris Edit. 1552, et alibi.

The same Philo speaks more at large in another place:—"Why," says he, "does God say *in the image of God made I man*, and not in "his own image, as if he had spoken of another God? This scrip- "ture expression is for wise and good reasons, for nothing mortal "can be fashioned after the image of the supreme God and Fa- "ther of all things, but of his Word, who is the second God." Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. 7. 13.

See the passage quoted at large in Allix's Judgment, p. 130.

[6] The Fathers were unanimous in their judgment that these words were spoken by the Father to the Son, or Spirit, or both. I will produce a specimen.—Barnabas says:—"And for this the Lord was "contented to suffer for our soul, though he be the Lord of the "world; to whom God said the day before the formation of the "world, Let us make man after our image and similitude." Ep. c. 5.

Hermas says, "He was present in counsel with his Father for "the forming of the creature." Sim. 9. sec. 12.

Theophilus of Antioch says, "He directed these words, *Let us* "*make man*, to none other, but his own Word and his own Wisdom." Ad. Autol. l. 2. p. 96.

Irenæus says, "His Word and Wisdom, his Son and Spirit, are "always present with him, to whom also he spake, saying, *Let us* "*make man*, &c. Lib. 4. cap. 37. and lib. 5. c. 15.

Again:—Man was fashioned after the image and likeness of the uncreated God, the Father, willing his creation, the Son ministering and forming him, the Holy Ghost nourishing and encreasing him. Lib. 4. cap. 75.

Tertullian says, "Nay, because his Son is ever present with him, "the second person, his Word; and the third, the Spirit in the "Word; therefore he spake in the plural, *Let us make man in our* "*image.*" Adv. Prax. c. 12.

pressing a plurality of persons. And, as may be fully gathered from other parts of the bible, the persons expressed, or implied, are no other than the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST: for these three, and no

Novatian says, "Who does not acknowledge the Son to be the "second person after the Father, when he reads that it was said to "the Son by the Father, *Let us make man.*" Cap. 21, 25.

Origen says, "To him also spake he (the Father) *Let us make "man after our image.*" Cont. Cel. lib. 1. p. 63.

"Who is this," saith Athanasius, "that God converses with "here? To whom are these notifications and determinations of his "pleasure directed? Not to any of the creatures already made; "much less to those things which were not yet created; but, un-"doubtedly to some person, who was then present with the Father, "with whom he communicated his counsels, and of whose agency "he made use in the creation of them. And who could this be "but his eternal Word? With whom can we conceive the Father "holding this conference, but with his Son, the divine Logos, that "Wisdom of God, that was present with him, and acted with him, "in the creation of the world, who was in the beginning with God, "and was God? and who saith of himself, *When he prepared the "heavens, I was there; when he appointed the foundations of the "earth, then was I by him, as one brought up with him.*"

St. Augustine saith, "Had God said no more, than, *Let us make "man*, it might, with some colour, be understood as spoken to the "angels, whom the Jews pretend he employed in framing the body "of man, and other creatures: but seeing it immediately follows, "*after our image*, it is highly profane to believe, that man was made "after the similitude of angels; and that the similitude of God "and angels is one and the same."

St. Ambrose speaks to the same purpose: "God could not speak "thus to his servants, because it is not to be thought, that servants "were partners with their Lord, in his works of creation; or the "works, with their Author. And, supposing this should be admit-"ted, that the work was common to God and angels, yet the image "was not common."

Nay the second counsel of Sirmium which was held in 351 pronounces an anathema upon all those who denied this. The words are these:—"If any one say, that the Father did not speak to the "Son when he said, *Let us make man*, but that God spake to him-"self, let him be accursed." Socrat. lib. 2. c. 30, where the creed may be seen at large.—Epiphanius says, "This is the lan-"guage of God to his Word, and Only-begotten, as all the faith-"ful believe." Hæres. 23. n. 2. And again he says, "Adam "was formed by the hand of the Father, and the Son, and the "Holy Ghost." Hæres. 44. n. 4. See Bibliotheca Biblica on the place.

no other, were concerned in the work of creation.[7] Compare Job 26. 13; 33. 4; Ps. 33. 6; Ecc. 12. 1; Is. 40. 13; Mal. 2. 15; John 1. 3; Col. 1. 16; and Heb. 1. 2, 10.

616.* In the third chapter we have an expression of the same kind:—*And the* LORD GOD *said, Behold the man is become as* ONE OF US,[8] *to know good and evil.*

These

[7] I observe more at large from Irenæus, that he rejects the notion of the Jews and Heretics, who supposed God spake to his Angels. For disputing against heretics, who attributed the creation of the world to Angels, and powers separate from the one true God, he says thus:—"Angels did not make us, nor did they form us; neither was it in their power to make the image of God: none but the Logos could do this; no powers distinct from the Father of all things: for God did not want their assistance in making the things which he had ordained. For his Word and his Wisdom, the Son and the Holy Ghost, are always with him; by whom and with whom, he made all things freely, and of his own accord; to whom also he spake in these words, *Let us make man in our image and likeneſs.*" Lib. 4. cap. 37.

Dr. Waterland says, that "this text, Gen. 1. 26. has been understood of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or at least of Father and Son, by the whole stream of Christian writers, down from the times of the Apostles. The Christians were not singular in thinking that the text intimated a plurality. The Jews before, and after, believed so too, as appears from Philo, and Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew; only they interpreted the text of God and his Angels, which the Christians understood of the Persons of the Trinity." Eight Sermons, p. 69.

For a just view of this consultation between the persons of the Godhead see Dr. Kennicott's Dissertation on the Tree of Life, p. 29, 30, and 71.

Kircher quotes a whole sentence from Rabbi Hakadosch, where all the persons in the Trinity are expressly mentioned—"The Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Spirit God, Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity." See Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 536.

[8] Justin Martyr, quoting these words, says, "Here there is one speaking to one other at least, distinct in number, and rational or intelligent." Dial. cum Tryp. p. 285.

Bishop Patrick upon the place observes, that "these words plainly insinuate a plurality of persons in the Godhead; and all other explications of them seem forced and unnatural: that of Mr.

These words also imply a plurality, and were so understood by several of the Ancients. Philo, the learned Jew, expressly says, that they are to be understood of more than one.[9] And the Jerusalem Targum paraphrases them thus:—"The Word of Jehovah said, "Here Adam, whom I created, is the only-begotten "Son in the world, as I am the only-begotten Son in "the high heavens."

617.* *Ye shall be as* GODS *knowing good and evil:*[1]

Gods knowing: both the noun and the participle are plural. The speaker too, is that apostate spirit, who had been cast out of heaven, which gives extraordinary significance to the expression.

618.* *And the Lord said, Go to; let* US[2] *go down, and there confound their language.* Gen. 11. 7.

This

"Calvin being as disagreeable to the Hebrew phrase, as that of "Socinus to the excellency of the Divine Nature. This is well "proved, I think, by Theodoric Hackspan, Disput. 4. De Locut. "Sacris n. 15, &c."

[9] De Confu. Ling. p. 344. See also Bibliotheca Biblica on the place.

[1] Gen. 3. 5. כאלהים ידעי

[2] The same Philo, we have just mentioned in these notes, confesses, that it is plain "God spake to some here as worker together "with him." De Conf. Ling. p. 344. See also Bibliotheca Biblica on the place, Gen. 11. 7. Consult likewise Bp. Patrick, who is of the same opinion.

Justin Martyr says, "That Jehovah, who descended to see the tower, was the Son of God." Dial. cum Tryph. p. 356.

Tertullian says, "It is the Son, who from the beginning gave "judgment, beating down the lofty tower, and confounding their "tongues." Ad: Prax. c. 16.

And Novatian the same:—"What God," says he, "do they "suppose descended hither to that tower, seeking to visit those men "at that time? It was neither the Father who descended, neither an "Angel: it remains, therefore, that *he* descended, of whom the "the apostle Paul said, *He that descended is the same also that ascended*, &c. that is, the SON, the WORD of God." De Trinit. c. 25.

This is another of those passages which has been understood by many of the most learned men of all ages as conveying some intimation of a plurality of persons in the Divine Nature.

619.* *The* LORD *rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire* FROM THE LORD *out of heaven.* Gen. 19. 24.

Menasseh, ben Israel, confesses this place too hard for him, unless by the LORD who is on earth, you understand the angel Gabriel, who, as God's ambassador, bears the name of God. The ancient Jews, however, found no such difficulty in it: for Philo holds, that it was the LOGOS that rained fire from heaven. He says, moreover, that GOD and his two POWERS are spoken of in the history of Sodom. [3]

[3] See Allix, p. 131, 148.

Philo says, that, in the one true God there are two supreme and primary *Powers*, whom he denominates *Goodness* and *Authority*; and that there is a *third and Mediatorial Power* between the two former, who is the *Logos*. Dissert. de Cherub.

Speaking of the Divine Being appearing to Abraham, he acquaints us, that he came attended by his two most high and puissant *Powers*, *Principality* and *Goodness*; "*himself* in the middle of those "*Powers*; and, though *one*, exhibiting to the discerning soul the "appearance of *three*."

In a third place he is still more decisive; for, he says, "*The Father of All* is in the middle." He moreover calls one the *Power, Creator*, and the other the *Power, Regal*. He then adds, *The Power, Creator, is God*; the *Regal Power is called Lord*. See Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 545, 546.

St. Ambrose says upon this passage:—"Abraham was not ignorant of the Holy Spirit. He really saw three, and adored one; "because one Lord, one God, and one Spirit."

See Witsius on the Covenants, book 4. ch. 3, where he speaks at large on this appearance to Abraham.

Prudentius, a Christian poet, who flourished in the fourth century, hath given the judgment of the ancients on the divine appearances, and especially on this to Abraham, to the following purpose:

"Where-e'er it's mentioned in the sacred code,
"That human eye beheld the form of God,
"This notes the SON, the Son of God most high,

620. *And it came to pass when* GOD *caused me to wander from my father's house.*[4] In the Hebrew it is, *When* GODS *caused me to wander.* Both the noun and the verb are plural.

621. *There* GOD *appeared unto Jacob when he fled from the face of his brother.*[5]

In the original it runs—There GODS appeared: both the noun and the verb are again plural.—In short: The word Aleim, which we translate GOD, is evidently of the plural number, and has for its singular ALE. It is sometimes joined with a verb in the singular number; and sometimes it is joined both with adjectives, pronouns, and verbs of the plural number.[6]

622. *But God suffered him not to hurt me.*[7] Literally—But the Elohim gave him not to injure me. The noun and verb are both plural.

623. *Because there* GOD *appeared unto him.* Gen. 35. 7. האלהים נגלו Literally, because there *they*, even

" Whose form was manifest to human eye.
" Pure Deity our faculties transcends:
" No eye can see, no reason comprehends.
" But that to man God might this truth disclose,
" A shape, to sight conspicuous, he chose.
" Display'd to Abram this appearance was,
" Abram the founder of the chosen race.
" 'Twas this the hospitable man did see
" Beneath the shade of Mamre's hallow'd tree.
" But in the number of three guests divine,
" The sacred TRIAD did mysterious shine."

[4] Gen. 20. 13. התעו אלהים

[5] Gen. 35. 7. נגלו האלהים See Jones's Cat. Doct. p. 89.

[6] See Parkhurst's Hebrew and English Lexicon, p. 22. where many more of such instances are referred to. Consult likewise Mr. Parkhurst's Pamphlet against Dr. Priestley and Mr. Wakefield. p. 3—9, and p. 148, &c.

[7] Gen. 31. 7. נתנו אלהים

even GOD, was revealed unto him. Here again a verb plural, is joined with the name of God, to signify the mystery of the *Trinity* in the *unity* of the Godhead. See Ainsworth in loco.

624. *For I the* LORD *thy* GOD *am a jealous* GOD.[8]

Here are three words by which to express the Almighty—JEHOVAH, ELOHIM, and EL, referring, as some have thought, to the three persons in the Divine Nature. Such, at least, was the opinion of an ancient Jewish writer. His words are as follow: "*I am the Lord, thy God, a jealous God. Three* answering to the *three* by whom the world was made."[9]

When God revealed himself to Moses, he passed by and proclaimed his name three times over:

625. *The* LORD, *the* LORD, GOD, *gracious and merciful.*[1]

This seems to be an intimation of the same mysterious truth, that the Divine Nature exists under the three distinctions of *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.*

626. *Up, make us* GODS, *which shall go before us.* Ex. 32. 1. It is plain the word Elohim is here used as a plural noun.[2] עשה לנו אלהים אשר ילכו לפנינו,—The Septuagint translates אלהים here, as well as in several other places θεοι and θεος.

[8] Ex. 20. 5.——[9] The Author of Midrash Tillim. See Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah, p. 3. p. 84.

Bishop Patrick also observes upon the 40th verse of the 23 ch. of Leviticus that on a certain day of the year the Jews frequently repeat the following prayer, as though they besought the blessed Trinity to save and send them help:

"For thy sake, O our *Creator*, hosanna.

"For thy sake, O our *Redeemer*, hosanna.

"For thy sake, O our *Seeker*, hosanna."

[1] Ex. 34. 6. יהוה יהוה אל—Jehovah, Jehovah, God. See Ainsworth on the place.

[2] It is objected, that if we make Elohim a plural noun, then *Ba-*

The blessing pronounced by the priest upon the people, when he dismissed them from the daily service of the temple, was very remarkable, and, as some suppose, in the name of the three persons in the Divine Nature:—

627.* *The* LORD *bless thee, and keep thee:*
The LORD *make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee:*
The LORD *lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.*[3]

May

alim and others must be plural, because they too are used with verbs in the singular or plural number, according to circumstances. But this objection is of no force, when it is considered, that the Heathens actually worshipped a plurality of gods. If, therefore, they gave them plural names on any occasion, it is nothing more than might have been expected. Besides, it is not improbable, but the errors which prevailed among them, respecting the multiplicity of their Gods, might take their rise from the Hebrew Elohim; and they might chuse to speak of their deities in a plural form in imitation of this name.

Granting, however, that the Hebrew language does abound with such irregularities (and every other language more or less does) as plural nouns with singular verbs, and the contrary, we do by no means rest the doctrine of the Trinity upon this foundation alone. There are various other corroborating circumstances, which the reader will strictly note as he goes along, that give an emphasis to these observations upon the word Elohim, not to be found in the plural noun *Baalim*, or any other of a similar kind. And then, when the great body of evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity is taken into the account, it is no way improbable, but God might design to give some intimation of the doctrine at the very opening of the bible, in the word made use of by which to express the Divine Being. This is the more probable, because all the dispensations of God to our world from the beginning have been of a progressive kind.

[3] Num. 6. 24—26.—Bishop Patrick says, "The repetition of "this name three times, in these three verses, and that with a differ- "ent accent in each of them (as R. Menachem observes) hath "made the Jews themselves think there is some mystery in it: "which we understand, though they do not. For it may well be "looked upon by us, as having respect to the three persons in the "blessed Trinity, who are one God, from whom all blessings flow "unto us, 2 Cor. 13. 14. This mystery, as Luther wisely ex- "presses it, upon Psalm 5, is here occulte insinuatum, secretly in-

May not St. Paul be justly supposed to explain this divine

" sinuated, though not plainly revealed. And it is not hard to shew, " if this were a place for it, how properly God the Father may be " said to *bless and keep us*; and God the Son to be *gracious unto us*; " and God the Holy Ghost *to give us peace*."

The learned Witsius enlarges somewhat more on this scripture:— " The three repetitions of the name Jehovah intimates a great mys- " tery; neither is the remark of R. Menachem to be rejected con- " cerning the three variations of the accents on the same word: " which, what can it signify more aptly than the adorable Trinity " of Divine Persons in one Deity, whence as from an ever-flowing " fountain all benediction is derived to us? Compare 2 Cor. 13. 14. Rev. 1. 4—6.

" The first section. *The Lord bless thee and keep thee*; " is very " conveniently referred to the Father, concerning whom Paul writes, " Ep. 1. 3. *Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus* " *Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual benediction in Christ*: " and to whom Christ himself saith, John 17. 11. *Holy Father,* " *keep them through thine own name.*

" The next section. *The Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and* " *be gracious unto thee*—belongeth unto Christ, who is the light of " the world, and of the heavenly Jerusalem, Rev. 21. 23; *whose* " *face shineth as the sun*, Rev. 1. 16; in whose face is *the light of* " *the knowledge of the glory of God*, 2 Cor. 4. 6; in whom is most " completely accomplished that proverb of the wisest of kings, " *In the light of the king's countenance is life, and his favour is as a* " *cloud of the latter rain*, Prov. 16. 15; in whom, finally, are *the* " *exceeding riches of his grace*, Eph. 2. 7.

" The last section. *The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee,* " *and give thee peace*—where he signifies the application of grace, " and the communication of peace and joy, and it is properly applied to " the Holy Spirit, through whom the *kingdom of God is* to us *righte-* " *ousness, and peace, and joy*, Rom. 14. 17." Misc. Sacr. lib. 2. diss. 2 p. 518.

An ancient Jewish author says, that the repeating Jehovah three times in this place teacheth us, " that these names of the blessed " God are three powers, and adds, Every distinct power is like to " each other, and hath the same name with it." Kidder's Dem. part 3. p. 86.

" Petrus Alphonsi, an eminent Jew, converted in the beginning " of the 12th. century, and presented to the font by Alphonsus a " king of Spain, wrote a learned treatise against the Jews, wherein " he presses them with this scripture, as a plain argument—that " there are three persons to whom the great and incommunicable " name of Jehovah is applied. And even the unconverted Jews, " according to Bechai, one of their Rabbies, have a tradition, that

divine benediction upon the Jewish church by the following benediction upon the Christian? *The* GRACE *of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *and the* LOVE *of* GOD, *and the* FELLOWSHIP *of the* HOLY GHOST, *be with you all. Amen.* If this was the view of St. Paul, as is highly probable, I think, then we have the best authority for applying the Jewish benediction in question to the three persons of the Divine Nature, Father, Son, and Spirit. The reader will attend to the evidence, and judge.

628. *What nation is there so great, that hath* GOD *so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for?*[4] In the original, it is *Gods so nigh.* Both the noun and the adjective are plural—אלהים קרבים

629. *For who is there of all flesh that hath heard the voice of the living God, speaking out of the midst of the fire?* Deut. 5. 26. What we translate the *living God* in this verse is *living Gods.* Both the noun and the adjective are in the plural number, as in the last case—.אלהים חיים When

" when the high Priest pronounced this blessing over the people—
" elevatione manuum sic digitos composuit, ut Triada exprimerent—
" he lifted up his hands, and disposed his fingers into such a form
" as to express a Trinity. All the foundation there is for this in
" scripture, is, Lev. 9. 22. As for the rest, be it a matter of fact
" or not, yet if we consider whence it comes, there is something
" very remarkable in it. See Observ. Jos. de vois. in Pug. Fid.
" p. 400, 556, 557."

Jones's Catholic Doctrine, p. 101.

Consult too Maurice's Ind. Ant. vol. 4. p. 589, 590, where this *triple* benediction is referred to the *three* Hypostases, by the practice both of the Jews and Mahometans.

[4] Deut. 4. 7. " The author of Zohar cites these words of R.
" Jose (a famous Jew of the second century) where examining this
" text, *Who have their Gods so near to them,* What, saith he, may
" be the meaning of this? It seems that Moses should have said,
" Who have God so near them. But—there is a superior God,
" and there is the God who was the fear of Isaac, and there is an
" inferior God; and therefore Moses saith, *The Gods so near.* For
" there are many virtues that come from the Only One, and all they
" are One."

Allix's Judgment, p. 169.

When Moses beginneth to rehearse and explain the Law to the people, the first thing he teacheth them, is, the nature of the one living and true God: but this he doth in such a way as seems to insinuate a distinction in the Supreme Being.

630. *Hear, O Israel, the* LORD *our* GOD *is one* LORD; or as it may be rendered, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord, our God, the Lord, is one.*[5] Here are three words, expressive

[5] Deut. 6. 4. שמע ישראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד Bishop Patrick on the place saith:—"Many of the ancient Fathers, particularly Theodoret and Greg. Nyssen, think there is a plain intimation of the blessed Trinity in these words, *The Lord our God is one Lord.* And some of the Jews themselves have thought, there was something extraordinary in it, that the name of God should be thrice mentioned, as it is in this sentence: which signifies three Midoth, or properties, they confess; which they sometimes call three Faces, or Emanations, or Sanctifications, or Numerations, though they will not call them three Persons.—The Cabbalists say as much, who asserting ten Sephiroth in God, which they take to be something different from the essence of God, and yet not creatures, but emanations from it,—they make the three first of them to be more than the other seven; and call them Primordial. The First of which they call the *Wonderful Intelligence* and the First *Intellectual Light* (as St. James calls God *the Father of Lights*) and the *First Glory*. The Second they call, among other names, the *Illuminating Intelligence*, (just as St. John saith, the Eternal Word *enlightens every one that cometh into the world*, and the *Second Glory*. And the Third they call the *Sanctified Intelligence*—which is the very same with the Holy Spirit. All this we find in the book Jetzira, which they fancy was made by Abraham. From whence we cannot but learn that they had an obscure notion of the blessed Trinity; and that the Apostles used no other language about it, than what was among the Jews: the best of whom are so sensible of such things, as I have mentioned, that they think we Christians are not idolaters, though we believe three Persons in the Godhead (which they fancy inclines to polytheism) because we believe the Unity of God, and therefore may be saved as well as they."

Let the reader consult also Bishop Kidder's Demonstration of the Messias, part 3d. p. 83, where he will find another ancient Jewish writer explaining this passage, Deut. 6. 4, of three distinctions in the Divine Nature.

How the ancient synagogue, or the old Jewish writers understood

expressive, as some suppose, of the three persons of the Divine Nature.

631. *The Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods, he knoweth.*[6] These are the words of the children of Gad, and the children of Reuben. El, Elohim, Jehovah: El, Elohim, Jehovah, he knoweth. This is the literal translation, and seems to refer to the same threefold distinction.

632. *Ye cannot serve the* LORD; *for he is an* HOLY GOD; *he is a jealous* GOD.[7] In the original it is *holy Gods*, the noun and adjective being both plural—אלהים קדשים. In the phrase, *he is a jealous God*, however, both the noun and the adjective are singular—אל קנוא הוא.

633. *What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom* GOD *went to redeem for a people to himself?* 2 Sam. 7. 23. הלכו אלהים.

Here

these words, will be farther evident, from an instance or two from their book of Zoar. The author mentioning this text in Gen. fol. 1. col. 3. and the three names *Jehovah, Elohenu, Jehovah*, says, "These are the three degrees in respect of the sublime mystery." See Dr. Gill on the Trinity, p. 19, 20, 21, for other observations of the same kind; and Jamieson's Vindication, book 1. chap. 6, where he produces much more evidence concerning the faith of the ancient Jews. There can be no question but they embraced the faith of the Holy Trinity, though with less distinct views than we Christians now do.

[6] Jos. 22. 22. An ancient Jewish writer, the Author of Midrash Tillim, observes, that in several texts of the Hebrew bible God is called by three names. He particularly mentions this passage, and the other I have noticed from the 20th chapter of Exodus. Upon the text before us he says, Why are these three names mentioned twice? And then he answers: "Because by them the world was "made, and because by them the law was given." See bp. Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah, part 3. p. 84.

[7] Jos 24. 19. Dr. Kennicot observes, that the first part of this verse, *Ye cannot serve the Lord*, ought to be translated, *Ye shall not cease to serve the Lord*, which removes a difficulty, and makes good sense.

Here also there is a peculiarity in the Hebrew, which does not appear in our version. It is *whom* GODS *went to redeem.* The noun and verb are both plural. Peter Martyr applies this to the three persons of the Divine Nature, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and says, this opinion is true, sound, and catholic. See his Common Places, part 1. chap. 12. p. 101, where he treats upon the subject pretty much at large.

634. *Where is* GOD *my* MAKER *who giveth songs in the night?* [o]

God, my *Makers*, in the Hebrew; alluding, possibly, to the original consultation—*Let* us *make man.* Job was no stranger to the three persons of the Divine Nature, though he might not have the same clear apprehension of their persons and offices as we have, who live under a brighter dispensation. Compare chapters 26. 3; 33. 4; 19. 25.

635. *Thou madest him a little lower than the* ANGELS, Ps. 8. 5.—מאלהים than the GODS.

636.* *By the* WORD *of the* LORD *were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the* BREATH *of his mouth.* [r]

This verse was commonly understood by the ancients of the Holy Trinity. Here is JEHOVAH, the WORD of Jehovah, and the Breath or SPIRIT of Jehovah. The first denotes the *Father*, the second, the *Son*, and the third, the *Holy Ghost.*

637*. *Thy*

[o] Job 35. 10. אלוה עשי

[r] Ps. 33. 6. See Allix's Judgment of the Jewish Church, passim: Likewise Gill on the Trinity, p. 60; and Waterland's Eight Sermons, p. 71, &c. where he vindicates this construction, and refers to the places in the works of the Fathers, where this text is quoted and applied to the three Persons in the blessed Trinity. Irenæus in particular says upon this text:—"The Father made all "things whether visible or invisible—not by angels, nor by any "powers separated from his own mind—sententia—for the God of "all stands in need of nothing; but by his own *Word* and *Spirit* he "makes and disposes all things; and governs and gives being to all "things." Adv. Hær. lib. 1. cap. 22.

Consult too Ainsworth on the place, where he considers JEHOVAH, his WORD, and his SPIRIT, as the MAKERS of the world.

637.* *Thy throne,* O GOD, *is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore* GOD, *thy* GOD *hath anointed* THEE *with the* OIL *of gladness above thy fellows.*[2]

In this celebrated passage is mention of the *Holy Trinity.* Here is the *Anointer,* the *Anointed,* and the heavenly *Unction.* The Anointer is the *Father;* the Anointed is the *Son;* and the Unction is the *Holy Ghost.*

638. *The* MIGHTY GOD, *even the* LORD *hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun, unto the going down thereof.*[3]

This is one of those places where the name of God is expressed by three words, as in the twenty second chapter of Joshua, and the twenty second verse. *El, Elohim, Jehovah,* hath spoken.

639. *Verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.* In the original, *Verily the Elohim are* JUDGES *in the earth.* Ps. 58, 12.——.אלהים שפטים See Ainsworth on the place, and also on the Ps. 3. 3.

640. *Man did eat Angels food.*[4] Ps. 78. 25.

641. *Who shall deliver us out of the hand of these mighty* GODS? *These are the* GODS *that smote the Egyptians with all the plagues in the wilderness.* 1 Sam. 4. 8. Here

[2] Ps. 45. 6, 7. Consult Irenæus, lib. 3. cap. 20. where these verses are explained in the same manner. See also King on the Creed, p. 126; and what has been said more at large upon this passage at No. 25 of this Apology.

[3] Ps. 50. 1. St. Cyprian seems to apply these words to Christ when he says:—"He is our God, that is, he is not the God of all, "but only of the faithful and such as believe. He is the God "who shall not keep silence when he shall be manifested in his "second coming; for then shall he, who came before in obscure "humility, appear manifest in power."

De Bono Patientiæ.

[4] אבירים *mighty ones,* in the plural number. See Jone's Catholic Doctrine, p. 92.

Here again Elohim is joined with two adjectives, *mighty* and *smiting*, in the plural number. The verse is literally thus: Who shall deliver us out of the hand of *these mighty*, or illustrious, *Elohim? These* are *those Elohim*, the *smiters* of the Egyptians. That the words *Alei*, and *Aleim* are both plural, is certain from psalm 96. 5. and 97. 7. In the former place it is said, *All the Gods of the nations are vain*—כל אלהי. And in the latter—*Worship him, all ye Gods*—כל אלהים. The reader will find considerable evidence upon these subjects in Mr. Parkhurst's answer to Dr. Priestley.

642. *I have said ye are* GODS. Ps. 82. 6. אלהים אתם —Ye Gods.

This is translated by St. John in the New Testament in the plural number θεοι and θεος. See John 10. 35. Whatever some, therefore, may talk of the idioms of the Hebrew tongue, this number and the last amount to a demonstration, that the Hebrew word ALEIM, or Elohim, which we commonly translate, GOD, in the singular number, is naturally, and properly, a plural noun.

643. *The* LORD *said unto* MY LORD, *Sit thou on my right hand.* Ps. 110. 1.

The ancient Jews always applied this verse to the Messiah. And it is remarkable that the Targum renders it, "The *Lord* said unto his *Word*, Sit thou on my "right hand."

The wise son of Sirach speaks nearly in the same terms:—"I called upon *the Lord*," says he, "*the Fa-*"*ther of my Lord*, that he would not leave me in the "day of my trouble." Ec. 51. 10.

Is not that remarkable text in Genesis explained sufficiently well by these two passages?—*The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven.* 19. 24.

Be it too diligently observed, that this is one place where *Word* is unquestionably used for the Messiah, as has before been noted.

644. *O give thanks unto the* LORD; *for he is good: for his mercy endureth forever.*

O give thanks unto the GOD *of gods: for his mercy endureth forever. O give thanks to the* LORD *of lords: for his mercy endureth forever.* Ps. 136. 1—3.

Here again is a repetition of three names of the Almighty, which some persons have thought may have an allusion to the several persons in the Godhead—Jehovah, Elohim, and Adeni. For my part, I lay no serious stress upon such repetitions, considered in themselves; but when taken in conjunction with the great body of evidence dispersed through the two testaments, they seem worthy of some attention. I consider them in the light of so many allusions to a doctrine more fully afterwards to be revealed. In every point of view, they are remarkable constructions, and should not be passed over in silence in an inquiry of this nature.

645. *Let Israel rejoice in him that made him.*[5]

In the Hebrew it is, *Let Israel rejoice in his* MAKERS. And this is very natural and proper, when we consider that the three persons of the Divine Nature, Father, Son, and Spirit, were all concerned in the original formation of man. *Let* US *make man.—Remember thy* CREATORS.

646. *The* SPIRIT *of the* LORD *spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The* GOD *of Israel said, the* ROCK *of Israel spake to me,* HE *that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.*

When

[5] Ps. 149. 2. בעשיו

When this passage is accurately translated it contains the names of the three persons in the Divine Nature.

" The SPIRIT OF JEHOVAH speaketh by me,
" And his word is upon my tongue.
" The GOD of Israel saith,
" Even to me doth the Rock of Israel speak:
" The JUST ONE ruleth over men!
" He ruleth in the fear of God. [6]

Here is *Jehovah*, which represents the Father; here is the *Just one*, which represents the Son; and the *Spirit of Jehovah*, which represents the Holy Ghost.

647. *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and the knowledge of the* HOLY *is understanding.* Prov. 9. 10. The original is, and the knowledge of *the Holy Ones* is understanding.—קדשים.

648. *I neither learned wisdom, nor have the knowledge of the Holy.* Prov. 30. 31. Here again it is in the Hebrew, the knowledge of *the Holy Ones*, as in the last instance.

649. *Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is* HIS NAME, *and what is* HIS SON'S NAME, *if thou canst tell?* Prov. 30. 4. Here is evidently mention made of two of the Sacred Three, the FATHER AND THE SON. [7]

650. *He that is higher than the highest regardeth, and there be higher than they.* The Hebrew is, *High ones over them.* [8] Eccl. 5. 8.

651. *Remember thy* CREATOR *in the days of thy youth.*

In

[6] See Green's Poetical Parts of the Old Testament, page 77, where this translation is defended. Turn to No. 39. page 96.

[7] See No. 41. page 99.

[8] גבהים. " This is understood even by the Jews themselves to " mean the holy and blessed God. Junius and Tremellius put " altissimus in their text, but acknowledge the Hebrew to be alti— " plurale pro singulari superlativo, mysterium S. Triados notans." Jones's Catholic Doctrine, p. 91.

In the Hebrew it is, *Remember thy* CREATORS. "To "the doctrine of three hypostases fabricating the world, "there is a most wonderful and decisive attestation "afforded in Eccl. 12. 1. Remember thy Creators, "for so it stands in the original Hebrew; which pas- "sage is thus translated, and commented upon by the "great Michaelis; *Memento Creatorum tuorum*; hoc est, "Triunius Dei qui te creavit. To this testimony of "the Hebrew patriarchs and prophets beingacquainted "with a threefold distinction in the Divine Nature, "may be added that of Isaiah 44. 24. *Thus saith "the Lord thy* REDEEMER." [9]

652.* *I saw the* LORD *sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the Seraphims: each one had six wings.—And one cried unto another, and said,* HOLY, HOLY, HOLY, *is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.* [1]

Here we see the Prophet had a vision of the Lord seated upon a throne, high and lifted up. The Cherubim and Seraphim stood above him. And they cried one to another in alternate strains, and said, *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts.* This ascription of holiness three times repeated [2] is supposed to belong to the three

[9] Maurice's Hist. of Indostan, vol. 1. p. 78.

[1] Is. 6. 1—3.

[2] Mr. Lowth in his Comment on the place says, that "the Chris- "tian Church hath always thought, that the doctrine of the blessed "Trinity was implied in this repetition." See also the late Bishop Lowth on the place, where he produces the words of St. Jerome, declaring that the mystery of the Trinity is here denoted.

"What important truths the Jewish church collected from this "passage in Isaiah will appear from their Talmud, which is the best "collection they have of the writings of the Jewish Doctors upon "the old Testament.

"Galatine has produced two expositions of this text, which are "strictly applicable to our purpose: the one is taken from the "illustrious R. Simeon, who has left a remarkable comment upon it:

three persons in the Divine Nature. For the *Lord* mentioned in the beginning is by all allowed to belong to the *Father*; St. John applies it to the *Son*; and St. Paul to the *Holy Ghost*. Justly, therefore, may we suppose, that the glorious Being, seen by the Prophet, was the *Lord of hosts*, as existing under the ineffable threefold character of *Father, Son*, and *Holy Ghost*.

This is further confirmed by what follows in the same chapter. For the enraptured Prophet soon after heard Jehovah saying, *Whom shall I send*? *and who will go for* us ?[3] plainly expressing the same plurality in the nature of the Divine Being which had been celebrated in the song of the Cherubim and Seraphim, when they cried one to another, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts. This, at least, has been the opinion of many very pious and sensible men, and was the general sentiment of the primitive church, from which no man should lightly, and without the best reasons, dare to dissent.

The most learned Origen in particular says—" They " are not content to say *holy* once or twice; but take " the perfect number of the *Trinity*, thereby to declare " the manifold holiness of God; which is a repeated " intercommunion of a threefold holiness; the holi-

" ness

" קדוש זה אב. that is, Holy, this is the Father: קדוש זה בן.
" that is, Holy, this is the Son: קדוש זה רוח הקדש. that is, Holy,
" this is the Holy Spirit.——The other is from a Paraphrast of
" very considerable note for the purity of his style, and his many
" useful explanations of the prophetic language, Jonathan, the son
" of Uzziel, the Chaldee paraphrast, who probably lived about the
" time of the first publication of the gospel. He paraphrases upon
" the text just in the words of the old Jewish language, the two
" languages being greatly alike, if not, as some learned men have
" imagined, originally the same. For thus his version supplies the
" whole sense, which was generally put upon the prophets—אבא
" קדוש *Holy Father*: קדוש בן *Holy Son*: קדוש רוח קדוש *Holy, Holy*
" *Ghost*."*

*Knowles's Primitive Christianity, p. 93.

[3] Is. 6. 8. See Lowth on the place.

" ness of the Father, the holiness of the only-begotten " Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Consult Jones's Catholic Doctrine, p. 105—109.

Chrysostom asks, " Whose glory? the Father's? " How then doth John apply it to the Son, and Paul " to the Spirit; not as confounding the persons, but " declaring the glory to be one?"—In loco.

Jerome says, " Who that Lord was that was seen " may be fully learnt from John the Evangelist and " the Acts of the Apostles. John evidently means " Christ; Paul, in the Acts, says, *Well spake the Holy* " *Ghost by Isaias.* But the *Son* was seen in the dress " of a king, and the *Holy Ghost* spake as being a partner " in the glory, and one with him in substance."—In loco.

Hurrion says, This visionary representation to the Prophet Isaiah contains a doxology to the Holy Ghost. See his admirable book on the Spirit, p. 188.

653. *When the* LORD *hath performed his whole work upon Jerusalem*—I *will punish the fruit of the stout heart.* Is. 10. 12.

The LORD and I are here mentioned as though they were two distinct persons. Possibly this may not be the case. It may be no more than an Hebraical manner of speaking. The reader will compare it with the whole body of evidence and judge.

654.* *And there shall come forth a* ROD *out of the stem of Jesse, and a* BRANCH *shall grow out of his roots; and the* SPIRIT *of the* LORD *shall rest upon* HIM. Is. 11. 1, 2.

Here likewise is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Here is *Jehovah*, representing the *Father*; the *Rod* from the stem of Jesse, representing the *Son*, and the *Spirit of the Lord* representing the Holy Ghost.

655. I *will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the* LORD OF HOSTS, *and in the day of* HIS *fierce anger.* Is. 13. 13.

Here

Here again two persons seem to be introduced, unless we suppose that the person speaking is the Prophet. In that case, the other is the Lord of hosts. If the Prophet is not the speaker, it can be no other than the Father or the Son declaring the displeasure of the former or the latter against Babylon for oppressing his people.

656. *And* I *will drive thee from thy station, and from thy state shall* HE *pull thee down.* Is. 22. 19. This is nearly in the same predicament with the former.

657. *The* LORD *is our judge, the* LORD *is our lawgiver, the* LORD *is our king; he will save us.* Is. 33. 22. Compare this with the former numbers where there is a triple repetition.

658. *Seek ye out of the book of the Lord and read—for* MY *mouth it hath commanded, and* HIS *Spirit it hath gathered them.* Is. 34. 16. Two of the Divine persons, the Father and the Holy Spirit, are clearly spoken of in this text. It is not equally clear whether the Son may not also be intimated.

659. *Who hath directed the* SPIRIT *of the* LORD, *or, being his counsellor, hath taught him?* Is. 40. 13. Here too we discover the Father and the Holy Ghost.

660.* *Behold my* SERVANT *whom* I *uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my* SPIRIT *upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.* Is. 42. 1.

The FATHER is here the speaker, the SON is the elect servant, and the HOLY SPIRIT is put upon that servant to qualify him for his great office.

661. *Thus saith the* LORD, *the King of Israel, and his* REDEEMER, *the* LORD OF HOSTS; *I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.* Is. 44. 6.

This passage may be applied both to the FATHER and the SON. Some, however, apply it wholly to the SON. Compare Revelation 1. 11, 17; 2. 8; 22. 13. where the characters of *first* and *last* are by our Saviour applied to himself.

662.* *And now the* LORD GOD, *and* HIS SPIRIT, *hath sent* ME. Is. 48. 16.* CHRIST represents himself in this verse as being sent by the LORD GOD, his FATHER, and by his SPIRIT, the divine PARACLETE.

663.* *For thy* MAKER *is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name: and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall he be called.* Is. 54. 5.

Thy MAKERS thy husbands, in the original. See Jones on the Trinity, p. 90. The Saviour seems to be denominated here *the* HOLY ONE *of Israel*, with a prophetic declaration, that he should become, in the due order of providence, the GOD of the whole earth.

664. *Thus saith the* LORD, *the* REDEEMER *of Israel, and his* HOLY ONE, *to him whom man despiseth—because of the* LORD *that is faithful, and the* HOLY ONE *of Israel, and* HE *shall choose thee.* 49.

* See Jones's Catholic Doctrine, p. 97. See also the observations of John Xeres, a converted Jew, upon this passage in Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 514.

St. Chrysostom, after he had expressed his admiration that the Maker of heaven and earth should be sent by the Spirit, adds:—"Honour the Holy Spirit whom you have received; say often that "you are well rewarded: Christ has taken thy flesh, and given "thee his Spirit. This the saving law suggests, the prophets "speak, the apostles declare, the martyrs confess, the godly believe, "the church consents to, ignorance opposes, the faithful are fully "persuaded of, Christ is glorified; for his is the glory, and honour, and adoration, together with the Father, and the most holy "and life-giving Spirit, now, and forever, and ages of ages. "Amen."

Hom. De Spirit. Sancto.

49. 7. This verse is supposed by some respectable scholars to make double mention of the three persons of the Divine Nature.[3]

665.* *So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun: when the enemy shall come in like a flood, the* SPIRIT *of the* LORD *shall lift up a standard against him. And the* REDEEMER *shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the* LORD. Is. 59. 19, 20.

Here seems to be an intimation of all the three persons of the Divine Nature, as in some of the former cases. The FATHER is the speaker, the NAME and GLORY of the Lord seem to signify the SON; at least the term REDEEMER is expressive of the SON; and the SPIRIT of the Lord is mentioned under his own proper personal character, as acting in the business of his people's deliverance from bondage.

666.* *As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the* LORD, *My* SPIRIT *that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in* THY *mouth, shall not depart out of* THY *mouth.* Is. 59. 21. The FATHER speaks, and speaks to the SON, declaring that his SPIRIT should rest upon him and his people forever.

667.* *The* SPIRIT *of the* LORD GOD *is upon* ME: *because the* LORD *hath anointed* ME *to preach good tidings unto the meek.* Is. 61. 1.

We need only to observe, that the SON is the speaker in this passage, and the doctrine of the three Divine persons will instantly appear.

668.* *For the* LORD *said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie: so he was their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the* ANGEL *of his presence saved them.—But they rebelled,*

[3] See Wogan on the Proper Lessons, vol. 1. p. 297.

and vexed his HOLY SPIRIT, *therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them.* Is. 63. 8—10.

Here is the LORD, which represents the FATHER; the ANGEL of his presence, which is the SON; and the HOLY SPIRIT, which was vexed by the disobedient conduct of the Israelites.

669. *Neither hath the eye seen,* O GOD, *beside thee, what* HE *hath prepared for him that waiteth for* HIM. Is. 64. 4. Two of the persons, probably the first and second in the Sacred Trinity, seem to be denoted in these words.

670. *The* LORD *is the true God, he is the living* GOD, *and an everlasting* KING. Jer. 10. 10. Compare the former passages where three names seem to indicate the several persons in the Divine Nature.

671. *This matter is by the decree of the* WATCHERS, *and the demand by the word of the* HOLY ONES: *to the intent the living may know, that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men.* Dan. 4. 17.

Consult Allix's judgment, p. 153, where he attempts to shew, that the Watchers, in this place, signify the persons in the Godhead.

672. *And whereas* THEY *commanded to leave the stump of the tree roots.* Dan. 4. 26. The *Watchers*, the *Holy ones, mentioned in a former verse.*

673. *The* MOST HIGH GOD *gave to Nebuchadnezzar a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honour.—And* THEY *took his glory from him.* Dan. 5. 18, 20. The *Watchers*, the *Holy ones*, before mentioned.

674. *I beheld till the* THRONES *were set up, and the* ANCIENT *of days did sit.* Dan. 7. 9.

The authors of the Talmud appear to have understood

stood this passage as conveying an idea of plurality.[6] Thrones being erected seem to imply this.

675. *Now, therefore, O our* GOD, *hear the prayer of thy servant—for the* LORD'S *sake.* Dan. 9. 17. for the sake of MESSIAH, who was frequently distinguished, even among the ancient Jews by the appellation LORD.—*The Lord said unto* MY LORD. Ps. 110. 1.

676. O LORD, *hear;* O LORD, *forgive;* O LORD, *hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God.* Dan. 9. 19.

This again is one of those triple repetitions, of which we have had several former instances. Whether there may be any peculiar signification in them, I undertake not to determine. Some have been of this opinion, and therefore I bring a number of such constructions into one view, that the reader may see and judge for himself. My own judgment wishes to rest the great doctrine of the Trinity on nothing but what is plain and solid. And enough of this substantial evidence is to be found in the sacred writings. All human explications likewise I equally renounce. They may be just, or otherwise. I regard them not. The scriptures alone are enough for me. With them I wish to stand or fall.

677. I *will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the* LORD *their* GOD. Hos. 1. 7.

Jehovah is the speaker, and he declares he will save the house of Judah by the Lord their God, which is evidently in this place the name of Messiah, the universal Saviour of mankind. No shuffling can honestly evade this conclusion, according to my apprehension. The deliverance of Hezekiah and his people from the invasion of Sennacherib seems to have been only a type of a spiritual and much greater deliverance.

678. *Judah*

[6] See Maurice's Ind. Ant. vol. 4. p. 479.

678. *Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the* SAINTS. Hos. 11. 12. Faithful with the HOLY ONES—קדושים.

679.* *I am with you saith the* LORD OF HOSTS; *according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so* MY SPIRIT *remaineth among you; fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of hosts—I will shake all nations, and the* DESIRE *of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts.* Hag. 2. 5-7.

Here we find three sacred Persons again distinctly mentioned. The first is the LORD OF HOSTS; the second, the DIVINE SPIRIT; and the third, the DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS, which is no other than the Son of God.

680. I *will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the* LORD; *and many nations shall be joined to the* LORD *in that day and shall be my people; and* I *will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the* LORD OF HOSTS *hath sent* ME *unto thee.* Zech. 2. 10, 11.

This promise evidently hath respect to gospel-times. The FATHER engages to send his SON, who should dwell in his people by his SPIRIT.

681. *And* I *will strengthen them in the* LORD, *and they shall walk up and down in* HIS *name, saith the* LORD. Zech. 10. 12.

The LORD promises to strengthen his people by the LORD. The latter term seems to signify the Messiah. The Father further declares, that believers should walk up and down in the name of his Son with holy joy and confidence.

682. Lastly.—*If I be a master, where is my fear?* Mal. 1. 6. The Hebrew is, *If I am masters*—אדנים.

These

These are the principal passages, which have struck my mind in passing through the Old Testament, as denoting a plurality of divine persons, more or less distinctly. Some of them are strong and clear; some contain bare intimations only of a doctrine more fully delivered in other places. A small number of them, it is not improbable, may contain mere imaginary allusions to the great doctrine in question. It will be the business of the reader to compare such declarations as are obscure with such as are more perspicuous, and to form his own judgment according as the evidence shall appear to him, upon a conscientious investigation of the whole of revelation. And in such investigation, we should ever bear in mind, that the truth of a doctrine does not depend upon the frequency of its repetition in the sacred pages, but upon the simple fact, whether it is revealed at all. The immateriality of the Divine Being is fundamental in religion, but yet we do not find that it is more than once declared in the whole bible. If therefore the doctrine of the Sacred Three was revealed only once clearly, that once would be sufficient to establish it as a truth.

PART FOURTH.

SECTION II.

A view of the doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY from the New Testament.

THE writings of the Old Testament are sufficiently strong and clear to establish the doctrine of the SACRED TRINITY. We have seen that the THREE PERSONS of the DIVINE NATURE occur therein, in the same verse or context, not less than ten times, besides the

the frequent mention that is made of each person separately. The New Testament, however, confirms all that had been advanced upon the subject in the Old, and displays the doctrine still more strongly. All the intimations of the latter are confirmed by plain declarations in the former, as all the declarations of the latter too are rendered more conspicuous by the facts and illustrations of the former; insomuch that the two Testaments, taken together, form one complete code of religious information; sufficiently luminous to be a rule of faith and practice, but by no means so full and perspicuous as to gratify the impertinent inquiries of vain and sceptical men. We will proceed to the New Testament declarations in order, where the reader will find upwards of one hundred places in which the THREE PERSONS of the DIVINE NATURE are distinctly mentioned together, either in the same verse, or in the course of the context.

683. *While he thought on these things, behold the angel of the* LORD *appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the* HOLY GHOST. *And she shall bring forth a* SON, *and thou shalt call his name Jesus.* [7] Here we

[7] Mat. 1. 20, 21. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity abounds in the sacred scriptures and the writings of antiquity much more than any person, who has not investigated the subject could suppose. Origen had a just notion of the importance of the doctrine when he said:—"When I speak of the omnipotence of GOD, of his invisibility "and eternity, I speak of things sublime: when I speak of the coe- "ternity of his only-begotten SON, and the other mysteries which "concern him, I speak of things sublime: when I discourse of the "majesty of the HOLY GHOST, I speak of things sublime. These "alone afford an elevated subject of discourse. After these *three* "you can speak of nothing sublime; for all things are low and "abject, when compared to the glorious height of this *Trinity*. "Cease, therefore, to speak in elevated strains, unless when you "discourse of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*." In Reges lib. 1.

we find the LORD, the HOLY GHOST, and the SON JESUS.

684. GOD *is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.*—I *indeed baptize you with water—but* HE *that cometh after me—shall baptize you with the* HOLY GHOST, *and with fire.* Mat. 3. 9, 11. Here again we have GOD, him that came after John, the MESSIAH, and the HOLY GHOST.

685. *And* JESUS, *when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water, and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the* SPIRIT OF GOD *descending like a dove, and lighting upon him; and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved* SON, *in whom* I *am well-pleased.*[1] This is sufficiently

[1] Mat. 3. 16, 17.—" It was convenient," says the learned Lightfoot, " that the Holy Ghost should reveal himself at this time : " First, for the sake of John, who was to have a sensible sign, " whereby to inform him, which was the Messias, as John 1.

" Secondly, In regard of the Holy Ghost himself, whose work " in the church was now in a more special and frequent manner to " be shewed under the gospel, namely, that he might be expressed " and revealed to be a personal substance, and not an operation " of the Godhead only, or qualitative virtue. For qualities, oper- " ations, and acts, cannot assume bodily shapes, nor ought but what " is in itself substantial.

" Thirdly, That a full and clear, yea, even a sensible demon- " stration of the Trinity might be made at this beginning of the " gospel. For it may be observed in scripture, that the Holy Ghost " hath a special regard to express this mystery upon singular occa- " sions, that we might learn to acknowledge the three persons in " one Godhead, as he also doth the two natures of Christ, that we " might acknowledge them in one person. So the very first thing " that is taught in all the bible, is this very mystery. For when " Moses beginneth the story of the creation, he beginneth also to " teach, that the three persons in the Trinity were co-workers in it. " *God created*, there is the Father. *God said*, there is the Word, " or the Son. *And the Spirit of God moved*, there is the Holy " Ghost. And the very same mystery is intimated by the prophet, " treating upon the very same subject. Is. 42. 5. Thus saith God " the Lord, he that created the heavens, and THEY that stretched " them out : that we might learn, that *of him, through him, and to* " *him*, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are all things, Rom. 11. " 36. So Moses also, when he is to teach concerning the creation

plain, and contains a sensible demonstration of the doctrine of the sacred Trinity.

686. *It*

" of man, he first teacheth, that it was the Trinity that created him. " Gen. 1. 26. *And God said, Let* US *make man after our image.* " He saith, *Let* US, to shew the trinity of persons; and he saith, " *In* OUR *image*, not in our images, to shew the unity of essence; " that every man, even from the reading of the story of his cre- " ation may learn to *remember his* CREATORS in the days of his " youth, as Solomon with the word בוראיך, answereth the same " mystery.—Ec. 12. 1.

" So likewise at the confusion of tongues the Trinity is expressed. " Gen. 11. 7. *Let* US *go down and confound their language*: as it is " also at the gift of tongues, *I will send the Comforter from the* " *Father*. John 15. 26. Acts 1. 4. Such a one also was the " blessing pronounced by the priest upon the people, when he dis- " missed them from the daily service of the temple, in the name " of the Trinity, Num. 6. 24—26, the name Jehovah, or the " Lord, three times repeated, for denotation of the three persons, " as Paul explaineth it, 2 Cor. 13. 14. When Moses also be- " ginneth to rehearse the law to Israel, and to explain it, the first " thing he teacheth them is the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Tri- " nity, Deut. 6. 4. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord, our God, the Lord* " *is one*. Three words answering the three persons, and the middle " word *our God*, decyphering fitly the second, who assumed our " nature, as is well observed by Galatinus. To these may be added, " the entrance of Moses's revelation with the name of the Lord, " three times rehearsed, Ex. 34. 6. The vision of Isaiah with " three holies, Is. 6. 3. The beginning of Ps. 50, and of Ps. " 136, and many of the like nature, which the heedful reader will " observe himself. How fitting then was it, that at the beginning " of the new world, and the new law, and the baptism of Christ, " the three persons should be revealed, especially since he ordained " baptism to be administered in their names; *baptize them in the* " *name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Mat. 28. 19. Works, vol. 1. p. 483, 484.

" The three persons in the Godhead did, there, so conspicuously " manifest themselves, that the Ancients took thence occasion to " tell the Arians; *Go to the river Jordan, and there you shall see the* " *Trinity.*" Allix's Judgment, p. 297.

St. Augustine saith—" The TRINITY most manifestly appear- " ed; the FATHER by a voice; the SON in the form of a man; " the HOLY SPIRIT under the figure of a dove."

In evang. Joh. tract. 6.

St. Jerome too hath it—" The mystery of the Trinity is demon- " strated in baptism: the SPIRIT descends in the form of a " dove; the voice of the FATHER is heard bearing witness to the " SON." In Mat. 3.

686. *It is not ye that speak, but the* SPIRIT *of your* FATHER *which speaketh in you.* Mat. 10. 20. Be it observed here, that the SON of God is the speaker.

687. *If* I *cast out devils by the* SPIRIT *of* GOD, *then the kingdom of* GOD *is come unto you.* Mat. 12. 28. Here too Christ is the speaker.

688. *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the* NAME *of the* FATHER, *and of the* SON, *and of the* HOLY GHOST. Mat. 28. 19.

This passage is extremely important. By being baptized in the NAME of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, we are dedicated to the worship and ſervice of the sacred *three*. That this was the sentiment of the primitive church will appear from an induction of particulars.

1. Justin Martyr says:—"God and his only begot-"ten Son, together with the Spirit, who spake by the "prophets, we worship and adore." Apol. 1. p. 56.

In another part of the same apology he tells the Emperor, that when any person was admitted a member of the Christian society, he was baptized "in the name of "God the Father and Lord of all, and in the name of "Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, "and in the name of the Holy Ghost, who spake by "the prophets, and foretold every thing concerning "Christ." Ibid. p. 94.

2. Irenæus speaks largely concerning the Sacred Three, and quotes this form of baptism in the very words, "*Go teach all nation, baptizing them in the name of the* "*Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" L. 3. c. 19.

In another place he says, "There is one God the "Father, who is above all, and through all, and in all. "The Father indeed is above all, and he is the head of

" Christ. The Word is through all, and he is the head " of the church. The Holy Spirit is in us all." L. 5. c. 18.

Again to the same purpose:—" The Father has ever " with him his Word and Wisdom, his Son and Spirit; " by whom, and in whom, he made all things freely." L. 4. c. 20.

And lastly:—" The God of all stands in need of " nothing; but by his own Word and Spirit, he makes, " orders, governs, and gives being to all things." L. 1. c. 19.

3. Tertullian frequently speaks of these three divine persons, and alludes on some occasions to this institution of baptism by our Lord. I will mention two or three passages from his writings. In the following words he makes the three persons of the Divine Nature equally the object of our faith and hope, the witness of our belief, and the surety of our salvation: " Our faith," says he, " is ratified by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. " Through the benediction we have them the witnesses " of our belief, and the sureties of our salvation. By " the Three both the witnessing of our faith and the " covenant of our salvation are pledged." De Baptism. c. 6.

Again he says—" The Father is God, and the Son is " God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and every one is " God." Contr. Prax. c. 13.

Again:—" The three persons are of one substance, " and of one state, and of one power, because they are " one God." Ibid. c. 2.

And again:—" The Father, and Son, and Holy " Ghost, are of one divinity." Id. de Pud. c. 21.

4. St. Cyprian says, " Christ himself commands the " nations to be baptized in the full and united TRINI- " TY." Epist. 73.

Again: " Christ here signifies the TRINITY, into a covenant with which the nations should be baptized." Ibid.

And

And again: "He that is baptized may obtain grace "by calling upon the TRINITY, even upon the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy "Ghost." Epist. 75.

Firmilianus too calls baptism "a symbol of the "TRINITY." Ibid.

5. Athenagoras is equally satisfactory. In answer to a charge of atheism he says:—"Who would not "be astonished to hear us called atheists, who acknow-"ledge the Father as God, and the Son God, and the "Holy Ghost, asserting their union of power, and dis-"tinction of order?"

Again to the same purpose:—"The Son of God is "the Word of the Father, in power and energy. By "him, and through him, were all things created: for "the Father and Son are one. The Father is in the "Son, and the Son is in the Father, by the unity and "power of the Holy Ghost. For the Son of God is "the Wisdom and Word of God.[9]

6. Origen

[9] Legat. pro. Christ. passim.

I add the words of a great and pious Modern:—"If the holy "scripture teacheth us plainly, and frequently doth inculcate upon "us, that there is but one true God; if it as manifestly doth a-"scribe to the three Persons of the blessed Trinity the same august "names, the same peculiar characters, the same divine attributes, "the same superlatively admirable operations of Creation and Pro-"vidence; if it also doth prescribe to them the same supreme hon-"ours, services, praises, and acknowledgements to be paid unto "them all; this may be abundantly enough to satisfy our minds, "to stop our mouths, to smother all doubt and dispute about this "high and holy mystery." Dr. Barrow's Defence of the Trinity, p. 61, 62.

The pious and excellent Richard Baxter also, who was a man of the most consummate abilities, says, "I unfeignedly account the "doctrine of the Trinity, the very sum and kernel of the Christian "religion, as expressed in our baptism."——

"The doctrine is neither contradictory, incredible, nor unlikely." Works, vol. 2. p. 132.

See this great man's various reasonings upon the nature of the Trinity in the same chapter from whence the above is taken.

The learned Lightfoot says; "Among the Jews the controversy "was about the true Messiah, among the Gentiles about the true "God: it was therefore proper among the Jews to baptize in the

6. Origen speaks to the same purpose upon many occasions:—"He who makes a good confession," says he, "ascribes to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each "their respective peculiars, but will nevertheless con- "fess that there is no diversity of nature or of sub- "stance." In Epist. ad Rom. cap. 10. lib. 8. p. 479.

Again:—"When we come to the grace of baptism, "renouncing all other gods and lords, we confess one "God alone, the Father, the Son, and the Holy "Ghost." Hom. 8. in Exod. 20. p 86.

Again:—"We believe the faith of Father, Son, and "Holy Ghost, in which all believe who are joined to "the church of God." Hom. 5. in Levit. p. 126.

Again:—"We who worship and adore no creature, "but Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as we err not in "our worship, so neither indeed do we transgress in "our actions and conversation." Lib. 1. cap. 1. in "Rom. p. 338.

And again:—"In short, It is an impious crime, we "may say, to worship any other besides Father, and "Son, and Holy Spirit. Ibid. p. 336.

7. Hippolytus, who was contemporary with Tertullian, quotes this very form of baptism, and reasons upon it in the manner following.

"If the Word was with God, himself being God, "some perhaps may object, What, does the Apostle "then make two Gods? No. I will not say two Gods, "but one, yet two persons; for the Father indeed is "one, but the persons two, because of the Son; and "and the third is the Holy Ghost. The administration "of their harmony leads to one God, for God is one. "The Father above all, the Son through all, the Holy "Ghost

"name of Jesus, that he might be vindicated to be the true Mes- "siah; among the Gentiles in the name of the Father, and of the "Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that they might be thereby instruct- "ed in the doctrine of the true God."

Works, vol. 2. p. 275, and p. 1130.

" Ghost in all. We can no otherwise consider God as " one, but as believing truly in the Father, and the Son, " and the Holy Ghost.—The Word of the Father " knowing the administration, and that it was the will " of the Father to be thus honoured, and not other- " wise, gave his disciples orders, after his resurrec- " tion, to this purpose; *Go teach all nations, baptizing* " *them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of* " *the Holy Ghost*; signifying, that whosoever should " leave out any one of the three, should come so far " short of honouring God perfectly: for by this Tri- " nity the Father is glorified. The Father willed, the " Son executed, the Spirit manifested." Cont. Noet. " c. 14. p. 21.

8. Jerome speaks of baptism in the same manner: —" Baptism," says he, " is one; for in the same " manner we are baptized into the Father, and into the " Son, and into the Holy Ghost; and are dipped three " times, that the sacrament of the Trinity might ap- " pear one. And we are not baptized in the *names* " of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, " but into the *one name* of God." Com. in Eph. c. 4.

9. St. Augustine reasons thus upon the form of baptism:—" He is one God, because we are baptized not " in the *names* of the Father, and of the Son, and of " the Holy Ghost. Where you hear one name, there " God is one: as it is spoken of the seed of Abraham, " and the apostle Paul expounds it, *In thy* SEED *shall* " *all the nations be blessed. He speaketh not of* SEEDS *as* " *of many, but as of one, and in thy seed, which is Christ.* " So, therefore, because he speaketh not there of " *seeds*, the Apostle wishes to teach us that Christ is " one. So likewise here when it is said in the *name*, " not in the *names*, in like manner as there in the *seed*, " not in the *seeds*, it is proved that God is one, Father, " and Son, and Holy Ghost." Tract. in Evang. Joh. 6.

689. HE *shall be great in the sight of the* LORD;—*and* HE *shall be filled with the* HOLY GHOST—*and many of the children of Israel shall he turn unto the* LORD *their* GOD. *And he shall go before* HIM *in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children,—to make ready a people prepared for the* LORD. Luke 1. 15—17.

The most inattentive reader cannot fail of discovering the three persons of the Divine Nature in this and many of the following quotations of holy scripture, without any observation being made upon them to that purpose. [1]

690.* *The* HOLY GHOST *shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the* SON *of* GOD. Luke 1. 35.

691.* *His father Zacharias was filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *and prophesied, saying, Blessed be the* LORD GOD *of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an* HORN *of salvation for us in the house of his servant David.* Luke 1. 67—69.

692. *It was revealed unto him by the* HOLY GHOST, *that he should not see death before he had seen the* LORD'S CHRIST. Luke 2. 26.

693. *He came by the* SPIRIT *into the temple. And when the parents brought in the child* JESUS—*then took he*

[1] The honourable Duncan Forbes observes, that when we have well considered the language of the Old Testament, concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "our surprise will cease at the freedom and easiness, with which Christ and his Apostles speak of "the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as distinct persons of the Deity, "as a thing well known and understood, without any preamble or "apology; whereas, if this had not been a notion commonly received by the intelligent, it is impossible that the preacher of salvation could have made use of, or applied it, without having first "explained it, and so prepared the hearers for it."

Thoughts concerning Religion, p. 153.

he him up in his arms, and blessed GOD. 2. 27, 28.

694. *And the* HOLY GHOST *descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a* VOICE *came from heaven, which said, Thou art* MY BELOVED SON; *in thee I am well pleased.* 3. 22.

695. *The* SPIRIT *of the* LORD *is upon* ME. 4. 18, the speaker, the Messiah.

696. *How much more shall your heavenly* FATHER *give the* HOLY SPIRIT *to them that ask him?* 11. 13. Christ is the speaker.

697. *Behold,* I *send the* PROMISE *of my* FATHER *upon you.* 24. 49. Christ undertakes to send the Holy Ghost to comfort and instruct his disciples, which the Father had before promised.

698. *Upon whom thou shalt see the* SPIRIT *descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the* HOLY GHOST. *And I saw, and bare record, that this is the* SON *of* GOD. John 1. 33, 34.

699. *Except a man be born of water and of the* SPIRIT, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of* GOD. 3. 5. Christ is the speaker.

700. *He whom* GOD *hath sent speaketh the words of* GOD; *for* GOD *giveth not the* SPIRIT *by measure unto* HIM. 3. 34. This is the testimony of John the Baptist to the Holy Trinity.

701. I *will pray the* FATHER, *and he shall give you another* COMFORTER. 14. 16.

702. *He that loveth* ME *shall be loved of my* FATHER, *and I will manifest* MYSELF *to him,* (by my Spirit.) 14. 21.

703. *The* COMFORTER, *which is the* HOLY GHOST, *whom the* FATHER *will send in* MY *name, he shall teach you all things.* 14. 26.

704. *When the* COMFORTER *is come, whom I will send unto you from the* FATHER, *even the* SPIRIT *of truth, which proceedeth from the* FATHER, *he shall testify of* ME. 15. 26.

705. *As my* FATHER *hath sent* ME, *even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the* HOLY GHOST. 20. 21, 22.

706. *Wait for the* PROMISE *of the* FATHER, *which ye have heard of* ME. *For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the* HOLY GHOST *not many days hence.* ACTS 1. 4, 5.

707. *It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the* FATHER *hath put in his own power: but ye shall receive power, after that the* HOLY GHOST *is come upon you.* 1. 7, 8. CHRIST is the speaker in each of these seven last testimonies to the doctrine of the Trinity.

708. *This* JESUS *hath* GOD *raised up.—Therefore being by the right hand of* GOD *exalted, and having received of the* FATHER *the promise of the* HOLY GHOST, *he hath shed forth this.* 2. 32, 33.

709. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of* JESUS CHRIST *for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the* HOLY GHOST. *For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the* LORD *our* GOD *shall call.* 2. 38, 39.

710. *Then Peter, filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *said, —by the name of* JESUS CHRIST—*whom* GOD *raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole.* 4. 8—10.

711. *They were all filled with the* HOLY GHOST, *and they spake the word of* GOD *with boldness.—And with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the* LORD JESUS. 4. 31, 33.

712. *The* GOD *of our fathers raised up* JESUS——*and we are witnesses of these things, and so is the* HOLY GHOST. 5. 30, 32.

713. *Stephen being full of the* HOLY GHOST—*saw the glory of* GOD, *and* JESUS *standing on the right hand of* GOD. 7. 55.

714. *When*

714. *When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of* GOD, *they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the* HOLY GHOST. *For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the* LORD JESUS. 8. 14—16.

715. *I believe that* JESUS CHRIST *is the Son of* GOD——*and the* SPIRIT *of the* LORD *caught away Philip.* 8. 37, 39.

716. GOD *anointed* JESUS *of Nazareth with the* HOLY GHOST *and with power.* 10. 38.

717. HE—*Jesus—who was ordained of* GOD *to be the judge of quick and dead.—While Peter yet spake these words, the* HOLY GHOST *fell on all them which heard the word.* 10. 42, 44.

718. *Then remembered I the word of the* LORD, *how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the* HOLY GHOST. *Forasmuch then as* GOD *gave them the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *what was I that I could withstand* GOD? 11. 16, 17.

719. *When—he had seen the grace of* GOD,—*he exhorted them to cleave unto the* LORD: *for he was a good man, and full of the* HOLY GHOST. 11. 23, 24.

720. *And* GOD—*bare them witness, giving them the* HOLY GHOST.—*But we believe, that through the grace of the* LORD JESUS CHRIST *we shall be saved even as they.* 15. 8, 11.

721. *I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of* GOD. *Take heed therefore—to all the flock over the which the* HOLY GHOST *hath made you overseers, to feed the church of* GOD, *which he hath purchased with his own blood.* 20. 27, 28.

722. *To whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of* GOD, *persuading them concerning* JESUS.—*And when they agreed not—they departed, after that*

Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the HOLY GHOST *by Esaias the Prophet.* 28. 23, 25.

723. *Declared to be the* SON *of* GOD *with power; according to the* SPIRIT *of* HOLINESS, *by the resurrection from the dead.* Rom. 1. 4.

724. *The love of* GOD *is shed abroad in our hearts by the* HOLY GHOST *which is given unto us:——For* CHRIST *died for the ungodly.* 5. 5, 6.

725. GOD *sending his own* SON—*who walk not after the flesh, but after the* SPIRIT. 8. 3, 4.

726. *Ye are not in the flesh, but in the* SPIRIT, *if so be the* SPIRIT *of* GOD *dwell in you. Now if any man have not the* SPIRIT *of* CHRIST *he is none of his.* 8. 9.

727. *If the* SPIRIT *of* HIM *that raised up* JESUS *from the dead dwell in you.* 8. 11.

728. HE *that raised up* CHRIST *from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his* SPIRIT *that dwelleth in you.* 8. 11.

729. *The* SPIRIT *itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of* GOD: *and if children then heirs; heirs of* GOD, *and joint-heirs with* CHRIST. 8. 16, 17.

730. *For* OF HIM, *and* THROUGH HIM, *and* TO HIM *are all things: to whom be glory forever.* 11. 36.

This has frequently been understood of the Sacred Three. "When all things are done," saith Athanasius, "by God through Christ in the Holy Spirit; "I see the undivided operation of the Father, the Son, "and the Holy Spirit; yet do I not therefore so con- "found together, *him by whom*, and *him through whom*, "and *him in whom*, all is wrought; as to be forced to "run the *three persons* into one." Contra Sabellianos.

In another place he says:—"There is but one sort "of Divinity, which is also in the *Word*; and one "God, which is the Father; existing of himself, as "being *over all*; and manifesting himself in the Son,

"as

" as being *through all*; and in the Spirit, as *working in* " *all*, through the Word and by the Spirit." Orat. 3. cont. Arianos.

Dr. Berriman, speaking of this doxology, says, " To the one supreme God, subsisting in a trinity of " persons, be glory; *of him*, referring to the Father, " *through him*, referring to the Son, and *to him*, or in " him, pointing out the Holy Ghost." Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine, understood the passage in the same manner. See Hurrion on the Spirit, p. 190.

731. *For the kingdom of* GOD *is—righteousness, and peace, and joy in the* HOLY GHOST: *for he that in these things serveth* CHRIST *is acceptable to* GOD. 14. 17, 18.

732. *Now the* GOD *of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another, according to* CHRIST JESUS, *that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify* GOD, *even the* FATHER *of our Lord* JESUS CHRIST. 15. 5, 6.

The God of patience and consolation is here spoken of as a person distinct from the Father, and from Christ Jesus; and so it is best understood to be God the Holy Ghost, who is the author of the Christian's patience and peace of mind.

733. *There shall be a* ROOT *of Jesse, and* HE *that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust. Now the* GOD *of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the* HOLY GHOST. 15. 12, 13.

734. *The minister of* JESUS CHRIST *to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of* GOD, *that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the* HOLY GHOST. 15. 16.

735. *I will not dare to speak of any of those things which* CHRIST *hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles*

tiles obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the SPIRIT *of* GOD. 15. 18, 19.

736. *Now I beseech you, brethren, for the* LORD JESUS CHRIST's *sake, and for the love of the* SPIRIT, *that ye strive together with me in your prayers to* GOD *for me.* 15. 30.

737. *I determined not to know any thing among you save* JESUS CHRIST—*and my—preaching was—in demonstration of the* SPIRIT *and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of* GOD. 1 Cor. 2. 2, 4, 5.

738. *Had they known it they would not have crucified the* LORD OF GLORY—*but* GOD *hath revealed them unto us by his* SPIRIT, 2. 8, 10.

739. *The natural man receiveth not the things of the* SPIRIT *of* GOD.—*For who hath known the mind of the* LORD, *that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of* CHRIST. 2. 14, 16.

740. *But ye are justified in the name of the* LORD JESUS *and by the* SPIRIT *of our* GOD. 6. 11.

741. *Know ye not that your bodies are the members of* CHRIST?—*Know ye not that your body is the temple of the* HOLY GHOST *which is in you, which ye have of* GOD, *and ye are not your own?* 6. 15, 19.

742. *Only in the* LORD. *But she is happier if she so abide after my judgment. And I think also that I have the* SPIRIT *of* GOD. 7. 39, 40.

743. *No man speaking by the* SPIRIT *of* GOD *calleth* JESUS *accursed.* 12. 3.

744. *There are diversities of gifts, but the* SAME SPIRIT. *And there are differences of administrations, but the* SAME LORD. *And there are diversities of operations, but it is the* SAME GOD *which worketh all in all.* 12. 4—6.

745. *Now he who stablisheth us with you in* CHRIST—*is* GOD; *who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest*

earnest of the SPIRIT *in our hearts.* 2 Cor. 1. 21, 22.

746. *Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of* CHRIST *ministered by us, written—with the* SPIRIT *of the living* GOD. 3. 3.

747. *When it shall turn to the* LORD, *the vail shall be taken away. Now the* LORD *is that* SPIRIT: *and where the* SPIRIT *of the* LORD *is, there is liberty.* 3. 16, 17.

748. *Beholding as in a glass the glory of the* LORD, *are changed into the same image—even as by the* SPIRIT *of the* LORD. 3. 18.

749. GOD, *who also hath given unto us the earnest of the* SPIRIT. *Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the* LORD. 5. 5, 6.

750. *What concord hath* CHRIST *with Belial?—Ye are the temple of the living* GOD: *As* GOD *hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them.* 6. 15, 16.—by my Spirit.

751. *The grace of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *and the love of* GOD, *and the communion of the* HOLY GHOST *be with you all. Amen.* 13. 14.

Having produced the sentiments of the Christian fathers pretty much at large on our Saviour's institution of baptism in the twenty eighth chapter of St. Matthew's gospel, I will here add some of the moſt remarkable doxologies which we find in their writings to the three persons of the Godhead, reserving the sentiments of the Fathers to be considered at greater length in the seventh part of these Disquisitions.

1. Polycarp, when he came to suffer, made an address to God, which he thus concluded:—"To thee, "with him (Christ) and thy Holy Spirit, be glory now "and through everlasting ages."[1]

2. The church of Smyrna, writing an epistle to give an account of Polycarp's martyrdom, close their letter

letter with these words:—"With whom (Christ) be "glory to God, even the Father, and to the Holy "Spirit."

3. Justin Martyr tells us that the Christians of his time "worshipped and adored the Father, Son, and "prophetic Spirit."

4. Clement of Alexandria says:—"Let us give praise "to the only Father and Son, with the Holy Spirit; "to whom be glory now and forever. Amen." Pædag. l. 3.

5. Hippolytus has this doxology:—"To him "(Christ) be glory and strength, together with the "Father and the Holy Spirit, in the holy church, now "and forever, and forevermore. Amen." Cont. Noet.

6. Dionysius Alexandrinus in the same age has this doxology:—"To God the Father, and his Son, our "Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be glory "and power forever and ever. Amen." Apud. Basil de Sp. Sanct. C. 29.

7. Chrysostom in the next age says:—"For his "(Christ's) is the glory and honour, and adoration, "together with the Father, and the moſt holy, and "good, and quickening Spirit, now and forever and "ever. Amen." Hom. de Spirit. Sanct.

8. To the same purpose in another place:—"To "thee (Christ) belongs glory, honour, and adoration; "and by thee to thy Father, in the Holy Spirit, world "without end." Hom. 18. in 2 Cor.

752. GOD *sent forth his* SON *made of a* WOMAN. Gal. 4. 4.—by the energy of the Holy Ghost.

753. *Because ye are sons,* GOD *hath sent forth the* SPIRIT *of his* SON *into your hearts.* 4. 6.

754. *That the* GOD *of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *the* FATHER *of glory, may give unto you the* SPIRIT *of wisdom and revelation.* Ep. 1. 17.

755. *Through* HIM *we both have access by one* SPIRIT *unto the* FATHER.[2] 2. 18.

756. *An*

[2] "That there is a real, and not only a nominal distinction be-

756. *An holy temple in the* LORD; *in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of* GOD *through the* SPIRIT. 2. 22.

757. *I bow my knees unto the* FATHER *of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST—*that he would grant you to be strengthened with might by his* SPIRIT *in the inner man.* 3. 14, 16.

758. *Unto* HIM *that is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, according to the* POWER *that worketh in us: unto him be glory in the Church by* CHRIST JESUS. 3. 20, 21. The power that worketh in us is unquestionably the power of the Holy Ghost.

759. *There is—one* SPIRIT—*one* LORD—*one* GOD *and* FATHER *of all.* 4. 4—6.

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. 4. 6. This is applied by Irenæus in the manner following: "The Father is "over all, and he is the head of Christ; the Word is "through all, and he is the head of the church: and "the Spirit is in us all. Lib. 2. c. 20.

760. *Grieve not the* HOLY SPIRIT *of* GOD—*and be kind—forgiving one another even as* GOD *for* CHRIST'S *sake hath forgiven you.* 4. 30, 32.

 761. *Be*

"tween the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; that they are "frequently spoken of in the holy scriptures in such terms as we "ordinarily use when we speak of three persons; that, although "the Son be often spoken of as really and truly a man, yet many "things are said of him, which cannot agree to a mere man, or to "any created being whatsoever; and that there are such things "also spoken of the Holy Ghost, as cannot be accommodated unto "a creature: moreover, that the Son derives his being from, and "always depends upon the Father, as the Holy Ghost does from "and upon the Father and the Son: all these things, are not to be "denied by any one, who will but interpret the holy scriptures ac-"cording to the ordinary sense and signification of the words "thereof, and not according to his own prejudices or pre-conceived "opinions."

Gentleman's Religion, p. 2. p. 20.

761. *Be filled with the* SPIRIT—*giving thanks*——*unto* GOD *and the* FATHER, *in the name of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST. 5. 18, 20.

762. *The acknowledgement of the mystery of* GOD, *and of the* FATHER, *and of* CHRIST. Col. 2. 2.

It seems, that the Holy Spirit is put first in this passage, and is called GOD without any epithet whatever. If this is denied, which no man can do with any proper evidence to the contrary, it will follow, that the Father and Christ, at least, are equally partakers of the Godhead. See Browne's Discourse on the Trinity, p. 30, 31. And for some judicious observations on the word *mystery*, see the same work, chap. 1 and 2. If the last meaning is thought to be the true one, it will be in the spirit of those words of Novatian:—"The Father "is declared to be the one true and eternal God, from "whom alone this Divinity being derived and com-"municated to the Son is returned to the Father by "a communion of substance." De Trinit. cap. 31.

763. *This is the will of* GOD *in* CHRIST JESUS *concerning you. Quench not the* SPIRIT. 5. 18, 19.

764. *We are bound to give thanks alway to* GOD *for you, brethren, beloved of the* LORD, *because* GOD *hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the* SPIRIT *and belief of the truth. Whereunto he called you by our gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord* JESUS CHRIST. 2 Thes. 2. 13.

765. *The* LORD *direct your hearts into the love of* GOD, *and into the patient waiting for* CHRIST. 3. 5.

The Lord prayed to here is the Spirit, in express distinction from God the Father, and from Christ; for the Apostle prays to this Lord to direct their hearts into the love of God, which is the peculiar office of the Holy Ghost; and also to cause them patiently to wait for Christ, which likewise is the work of the Spirit.

The

The Spirit, therefore, is that Lord to whom he prayed.

St. Ambrose says, "Let it be shewed what Lord it "is that directs into the love of God, and patient "waiting for Christ, if we deny the direction of the "Holy Spirit." De Spiritu Sancto, lib. 3. c. 15.

"By Lord here understand the Spirit," says Theophylact upon the place. And the great Basil explains the text in the same manner.

766. *Now* GOD *himself, and our* FATHER, *and our* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *direct our way unto you.* 3. 11.

767. *The* LORD *make you to encrease and abound in love one towards another, to the end he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before* GOD, *even our* FATHER, *at the coming of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST. 3. 12, 13.

768. GOD *hath not given us the* SPIRIT *of fear*:—*Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our* LORD. 2 Tim. 1. 7, 8.

769. *But after that the kindness and love of* GOD *our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the* HOLY GHOST; *which he shed on us abundantly through* JESUS CHRIST *our Saviour.* Tit. 3. 4—6.

770. *Which at the first began to be spoken by the* LORD, *and was confirmed to us by them that heard him*; GOD *also bearing them witness,—with divers miracles and gifts of the* HOLY GHOST, *according to his own will.* Heb. 2. 3, 4.

771. *How much more shall the blood of* CHRIST, *who through the eternal* SPIRIT, *offered himself without spot to* GOD? 9. 14.

772. *Elect according to the foreknowledge of* GOD *the Father, through sanctification of the* SPIRIT

unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of JESUS CHRIST. 1 Pet. 1. 2.

The Constantinopolitan Fathers in their Sydonical Epistle written, A. D. 382, speak in language conformable to these several representations of the three persons of the Divine Nature:—"We maintain," say they, "the most ANCIENT faith, conformable to our "baptism, and teaching us to believe in the name of "the Father, and of the Son, and Holy Ghost: so "that whilst we believe the one Deity, power, and "essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, toge-"ther with the equal dignity, and co-eternal majesty "in three perfect persons; there is no room for the "contagion of Sabellius, Eunomians, Arians," &c. See Theodorit. Ec. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 9.

773. *The precious blood of* CHRIST—*who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you; who by him do believe in* GOD—*seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the* SPIRIT. 1. 19, 21, 22.

774. CHRIST *also hath once suffered for sins—that he might bring us to* GOD, *being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the* SPIRIT. 3. 18.

775. *If ye be reproached for the name of* CHRIST, *happy are ye; for the* SPIRIT *of glory, and of* GOD *resteth upon you.* 4. 14.

776. *The power and coming of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST. —*For he received from* GOD *the Father honour and glory.—Holy men of* GOD *spake as they were moved by the* HOLY GHOST. 2. Pet. 1. 16, 17, 21.

777. *Hereby know we the* SPIRIT *of* GOD: *Every spirit that confesseth that* JESUS CHRIST *is come in the flesh is of* GOD. 1 John 4. 2.

778. *Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his* SPIRIT. *And we*

we have seen and do testify, that the FATHER *sent the* SON *to be the Saviour of the world.* 4. 13, 14.

779. *He that believeth that* JESUS *is the Son of* GOD:—*And it is the* SPIRIT *that beareth witness, because the* SPIRIT *is truth.* 5. 5, 6.

780. *There are three that bear record in heaven; the* FATHER, *the* WORD, *and the* HOLY GHOST; *and these three are one.* 5. 7.

Whether this passage be spurious or otherwise, the sentiment conveyed in it is extremely common in the writings of the Fathers. Irenæus says:—"He who "was adored by the Prophets as the living God, he is "the God of the living: and his Word who spake to "Moses, &c.—Christ, therefore, with the Father, is "the God of the living, who spake to Moses, &c.—"One and the same God the Father, and his Word, "always assisting to mankind, &c.—He that made all "things, is, with his Word, justly called the only God "and Lord.—He made the world by his Word, and by "his Wisdom."

Athenagoras says:—"We are not atheists, inas-"much as we believe the Creator of all things, and his "Word, to be God.—Who can but wonder to hear us "charged with atheism, who declare there is God the "Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Ghost?"

Tertullian says;—"It is mere Judaism to believe in "one God, in such a sense, as not to include the Son, "and after the Son, the Spirit." And a little after he adds—"The three together make one God."

See Dr. Fiddes's Theologia Speculativa, vol. 1. p. 386—396, for these and other quotations from the Fathers. Turn back too to the second part of this Apology, No. 310, page 319, where the subject of this note is considered more at large. See likewise part the third, No. 601, page 372.

781. *Praying in the* HOLY GHOST, *keep yourselves in the*

the love of GOD, *looking for the mercy of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST *unto eternal life.*[3] Jude 20, 21.

782. *Grace unto you and peace from* HIM *which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the* SEVEN SPIRITS *which are before his throne; and from* JESUS CHRIST. Rev. 1. 4, 5.

783. *I John—was in the isle that is called Patmos for the word of* GOD; *and for the testimony of* JESUS CHRIST. *I was in the* SPIRIT *on the Lord's day.* 1. 9, 10.

784. *He that hath an ear, let him hear what the* SPIRIT *saith unto the churches: To him that overcometh will* I *give to eat of the tree of life; which is in the midst of the paradise of* God. 2. 7.

785. *Even as* I *received of my* FATHER.—*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the* SPIRIT *saith unto the churches.* 2. 27, 29.

786. I *will confess his name before my* FATHER.—*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the* SPIRIT *saith unto the churches.* 3. 5, 6.

787. *Him that overcometh will* I *make a pillar in the temple of my* GOD—*and* I *will write upon him the name of my* GOD, *and the name of the city of my* GOD. —*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the* SPIRIT *saith unto the churches.* 3. 12, 13.

788. *To him that overcometh will* I *grant to sit with me in my throne, even as* I *also overcame, and am set down with my* FATHER *in his throne. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the* SPIRIT *saith unto the churches.* 3. 21, 22.

789. *And the four beasts—rest not day and night, saying,*

[3] "That there is a Trinity in the Godhead, of Father, Son or "Word, and Holy Ghost, is the plain, obvious sense of so many "scriptures, that it apparently tends to frustrate the design of the "whole scripture revelation, and to make it useless, not to admit "this Trinity, or otherwise to understand such scriptures."
Howe's Calm and Sober Enquiry concerning the Possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead, p. 135.

ing, HOLY, HOLY, HOLY, *Lord God Almighty; which was, and is, and is to come.* 4. 8.

790. *In the midst of the elders stood a* LAMB, *as it had been slain—having seven eyes, which are the* SEVEN SPIRITS *of* GOD, *sent forth into all the earth.* 5. 6.

791. *Here are they that keep the commandments of* GOD, *and the faith of* JESUS.—*Blessed are the dead which die in the* LORD—*Yea, saith the* SPIRIT, *that they may rest from their labours.* 14. 12, 13.

792. *I* JESUS *have sent mine angel—And the* SPIRIT *and the bride say, Come.—If any man shall add unto these things,* GOD *shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.* 22. 16—18.

Now all these things, concerning the persons of the *Father,* the *Son,* the *Holy Spirit,* and the *Undivided Trinity,* are written in the scripture for our edification. The bible is given *by inspiration of God, and is profitable for* DOCTRINE, *for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*

If then the bible is given by divine inspiration; if it contains all thing necessary to be known, believed, and done, to the attainment of everlasting salvation; and if, among other important matters, it reveals the doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Divine Essence; we are bound to receive the doctrine, not because we fully comprehend it, and can account for the mode of its existence, but simply upon the credit and veracity of the Revealer. Its incomprehensible nature can be no reasonable objection to our belief. There are a thousand things in the natural world that are also far above our reach, which we constantly profess to believe, and to which we are obliged to submit our understandings, or else act infinitely more absurdly, by running into universal scepticism. If any man, indeed, can demonstrate the real absurdity, or the impossbility,

of

of the doctrine, then, but not till then, it must be given up. Till then, what we believe of the glory of the Father, the same we believe of the glory of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality, except that the Father is the fountain of the Godhead.

We believe this, as a matter of fact revealed in the scriptures. But as to the manner in which they are united or exist, we believe nothing; we confess our ignorance, and readily declare, that we know nothing concerning it. So with respect to the existence of our own souls, what they are, where they reside, and how they are united to the body, we know nothing certain. It is all mere conjecture. Yet we have sensible demonstration, that they do exist, and are in an inexplicable manner united to these curious clay machines, which we call the body. This we do not deny. Nobody is charged with weakness and credulity in believing it: and yet, with respect to its mode or manner of existing and acting, we know just nothing at all. In like manner, with regard to the one living and true God, the belief of whose existence lies at the bottom of all religion, natural and revealed, we take the fact for granted, upon the principles of reason as well as revelation; but what do we know of his essence, or what do we comprehend of his perfections? We say, he is a spirit. Yet what a spirit is, we are not able to express, but by negative terms. His eternity, immensity, omniscience, omnipotence, are all equally out of the reach of our highest powers. Such, however, is the necessity of these attributes to our idea of a Supreme Being, that we are obliged to admit them all, though we are utterly incapable of comprehending any one of them. And then, as to the existence of a Being without beginning, a Cause uncaused, we know that the supposition involves an apparent absurdity, and yet this absurdity is the foundation of all religion, whether natural or revealed. The deist, equally with the believer,

liever, must embrace this absurdity as a first principle. If we reject it, and commence atheists, we must embrace a thousand absurdities and impossibilities.

If then we are assured that God is one; and if he has been pleased to speak of himself as existing under the three characters of Father, Son, and Spirit; what are we that we should refuse to speak of him in the same form? Surely he best knoweth his own glorious and incomprehensible manner of existence, and hath a right to say in what language we, his poor short-sighted creatures, should think, and conceive, and speak of him.

But if the doctrine of the Trinity be true, why was it not more clearly revealed in the first ages of the world? Why was it so long concealed?

We may as well ask, why God did not create the world 6000 years before it was created? Or why Christ did not die as soon as man fell? Or why man was permitted to fall at all? Or why the Gospel was not preached in all its glory and fulness at the very first? We may as well ask why man grows to maturity by degrees; and why he is not made in a state of complete perfection? Nay, we may with as much propriety find fault with God, and enquire of him, why we are placed upon earth for a while, in a state of trial and probation, and not rather translated to heaven as soon as born? God Almighty hath thought proper to order it otherwise. This we know to be a matter of fact, and this is answer sufficient. It becomes not us to dictate to the Sovereign of the universe. All the creatures of God, we see, are placed in a state of growing perfection. And all his dispensations towards mankind, have, ever since the foundation of the world, been advancing from a state of less to a state of greater light, greater perspecuity, and greater perfection. The Adamical dispensation, was, probably, the least clear and perfect. The Patriarchal was the next. The Mosaical was still more clear. The dispensation of John the Baptist was

yet more bright. But the dispensation of the Gospel, under which we live, is the brightest, the clearest, the fullest, the most complete of all.

But now that the revelations of God to mankind are finished, why is the doctrine of the Trinity left in so much obscurity, that it hath been a subject of contention ever since the beginning of the Christian dispensation?

It may be replied, that every doctrine both of natural and revealed religion hath been controverted, and is controverted at this day. Every principle in physics also hath been a subject of debate by one or another. And the more important the principle or doctrine, the more eagerly hath it been contested. But we say, secondly, that the doctrine of Christ's divinity and atonement; the doctrine of the existence, personality, divinity, and unceasing energy of the Holy Spirit, together with the doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity, are revealed with sufficient perspicuity for the purposes of religion. Is the Father called God? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father called Lord? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father eternal? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father almighty? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father omnipresent? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father omniscient? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father uncreated? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father incomprehensible? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Was the Father concerned in the work of creation? So was the Son, and so was the Holy Ghost. Is the Father the upholder of the universe? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Is the Father engaged in the regeneration of human souls? So is the Son, and so is the Holy Ghost. Are we baptized in the name of the Father? So likewise in the name of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Ghost. Is prayer addressed to the

the Father? So likewise to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. Are we blessed in the name of the Father? So likewise in the name of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Ghost. Hath the Father a personal existence? So hath the Son, and so hath the Holy Ghost. Did the Father conduct the Israelites to the holy land? So did the Son, and so did the Holy Ghost. Is the incommunicable name Jehovah given to the Father? So is it given also to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. Is holiness ascribed to the Father? So is it ascribed to the Son, and to the Spirit. Is goodness attributed to the Father? So to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. Is glory given to the Father? So to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

If it should be objected, that we misunderstand the scriptures, and that there is no such doctrine as that of the Trinity contained in them: It may be replied, that we do not pretend to be free from errors and mistakes any more than other men: but we all know, that the most serious and learned, the most inquisitive and pious men in all ages and nations of the Christian church, have steadily believed and professed it, as an essential truth revealed in the word of God.[4] It is true, the doctrine hath met with some opposers: but then this is only what was long ago foretold in the same scriptures should come to pass. And what doctrine has not met with opposers? The very existence of God hath been denied. The holy scriptures have been contradicted and blasphemed. The existence of angels, devils, and spirits, hath been called in question. Nay, even the existence of our own souls, by which we think, and act, and speak; and the very being of the substance and matter of which our bodies are made,

[4] "That there subsists some such union as that of three persons "united in one God in the Divine Nature, the whole tenor of the "New Testament seems to express, and it was so understood in the "earliest ages."

Soame Jenyns's View, p. 27.

and which we see with our eyes, and feel with our hands, have been denied and questioned. Let us not be surprized then, if the doctrine of the Divine Nature, as existing under the three incomprehensible characters of Father, Son, and Spirit, meet with its contradictors and blasphemers. It would be very surprizing if it did not, in such a world as is this of our's, and especially as we know this is only what the holy scripture foretold should come to pass. *But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them,*[5] *and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.* 2 Pet. 2. 1, 2. *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation; it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.*[6] *For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.* Jude 3, 4.

These are very striking and awful prophecies, and should

[5] "That Christ suffered and died as an atonement for the sins of "mankind, is a doctrine so constantly and so strongly enforced "through every part of the New Testament, that whoever will "seriously peruse those writings, and deny that it is there, may, "with as much reason and truth, after reading the works of Thucy-"dides and Livy, assert, that in them no mention is made of any "facts relative to the histories of Greece and Rome."

Soame Jenyns's View, p. 29.

[6] See Bishop Horne's excellent Sermon on the great duty of contending for the faith. The greater, the stronger, the more powerful the opposition to primitive truths, the more strenuous and zealous should the friends of those truths shew themselves. This is not an age for Christians to be lukewarm. The atheist would rob us of our God, the deist of our Saviour, the Socinian of the Spirit, and atoning death of that Saviour: and shall we be unconcerned spectators?

should make us all extremely cautious, how, and in what manner we conduct ourselves towards the Lord Jesus Christ. Here are false teachers foretold, who, in an artful way, should labour to bring in among the disciples of Christ damnable heresies. And which is the principal of these heresies? *Even denying the Lord that bought them.* Now was it ever known that any teachers in the Christian church so much as attempted to deny, that there had existed such a person as Jesus Christ? An attempt of this kind was never made by any *Christian teachers*, since the gospel had a being.

But there have been several, and there are several, in the Christian church at this day, who degrade the Redeemer to the level of a man. There have been several in times of old, and there are now several teachers in the church of England, and among the Dissenters, who have brought in this damnable heresy—do not think the expression harsh and severe, it is not mine, but the Apostle's:—And what is this damnable heresy? *Even denying the Lord that bought them*, so far as to bring him almost to a level with ourselves. They deny his divinity, his godhead, his pre-existent nature, his merits, his atonement, the efficacy of his blood. Now, surely, if the Redeemer is a partaker of the Divine Nature; if he assumed human form for the purpose of dying to atone for the sins of mankind; if he is the Creator and Upholder of the world, in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit; to say he had no existence before he was born of the Virgin, and to make him a mere good man, sent from God to teach the children of Adam his will; surely this is to *deny the Lord who bought us.* And then, it is very observable, that the same persons who deny our Lord's divine nature and atoning death, deny also the personal existence and divinity of the Holy Spirit. They absolutely deny, annihilate, subvert, destroy his very being, and barefacedly teach and profess, that there is no Holy Ghost.

If this is the truth, mankind are yet sitting in darkness,

ness, and in the region and shadow of death, notwithstanding all the advantages we are supposed to derive from divine revelation. The bible is ill calculated to lead into all religious truth. It is rather suited to mislead the Christian world. And, indeed, it hath misled the great body of Christians from the beginning to the present day. We, however, have not so learned Christ. We are well satisfied with the sacred writings. *To the law and to the testimony*, by the grace of God, we will evermore refer, and are persuaded, that *if any man speak not according to that word, it is because there is no* true *light in him.*

We will, therefore, close this part of our Apology by saying: *Grace and peace from* HIM *which* IS, *and which* WAS, *and which* IS TO COME; *and from the* SEVEN SPIRITS *which are before his throne; and from* JESUS CHRIST, *who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father: to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen.*

"To thee the FATHER, and the SON, and the HOLY "SPIRIT, be all glory, worship, and thanksgiving, "honour, and adoration, both now, and always, and "for everlasting and endless ages of ages. And let all "the people say, Amen." [7]

Amen and Amen!!!

[7] Constit. Apost. L. 8. c. 12.

PART FIFTH.

SECTION I.

Opinions of the *ancient Jews* concerning the *plurality* of the DIVINE NATURE, from the *Apocryphal* books.

IT will possibly be replied to all that has been said, though we mean well, yet we are mistaken, and misunderstand the scriptures upon these subjects.

This may be the case. We never have professed infallability. And be it observed, that the adversaries of the Trinity are equally fallible with ourselves. But in what manner did the Ancients understand them? If both learned Jews, Heathens, and Christians, who lived either before, or soon after our Saviour's time, believed that a Trinity of persons subsist in the Divine Nature, this will be a strong presumption, that the view we have before given of the doctrine is, in the main, the true one. Now it has already appeared, I apprehend, that the ancient Jews understood those passages of the Old Testament, which have been produced, and others of a similar kind, as conveying the idea of uncreated dignity in the Son and Spirit, and of a plurality in the Godhead. This has been ably proved by several learned men. I will, therefore, produce only a few more instances, and throw the whole into one view, to satisfy the inquisitive Christian, who wishes to be informed, and who may not have it in his power to examine such authors as contain this kind of evidence.

The Apocryphal books, which were mostly written before our Saviour's time by some learned Jews, being the oldest, we will begin with them, and proceed as near as may be in chronological order.

Tobit is the most ancient of these authors; he having

ing lived upwards of 700 years before the birth of our Saviour.

The only allusion to a *plurality* of persons in the Divine Nature to be found in this book is in the prayer of Tobias:—

1. "Blessed art thou, O God of our fathers, and "blessed is thy holy and glorious name forever; let "the heavens bless thee, and all thy creatures. Thou "madest Adam, and gavest him Eve his wife for an "helper and stay: of them came mankind; thou "hast said, *It is not good that man should be alone; let* "*us make* unto him an aid like unto himself." Ch. 8. 5, 6.—In the original of the Old Testament it is, I *will make an help meet for him.*

The book of Judith was written about 680 years before our Saviour. In this composition, the creation of the world is ascribed to the SPIRIT of God, or rather, in the language of the Jews, to the Son and Spirit of the Almighty:—

2. "I will sing unto the Lord a new song. O "Lord, thou art great and glorious, wonderful in "strength, and invisible. Let all creatures serve thee; "for *thou* SPAKEST, and they were made, thou didst "send forth *thy* SPIRIT, and it created them, and there "is none that can resist thy voice." Judith 16. 13, 14.

The first book of Esdras is generally supposed to have been written upwards of 600 years before the birth of Christ. I submit it to the judgment of the pious reader, whether the description, which the Hebrew youth gave of Truth, might not have some reference to our blessed Saviour, who is emphatically stiled *the* WISDOM *of God, and the Way, the* TRUTH, *and the Life*:—

3. "O ye men, are not women strong? Great is "the earth, high is the heaven, swift is the sun in his "course, for he compasseth the heavens round about, "and fetcheth his course again to his own place in one "day.

" day. Is he not great that maketh these things? " Therefore great is the TRUTH, and stronger than all " things. All the earth calleth upon the TRUTH, and " the heaven blesseth it: all works shake and tremble at " it, and with it is no unrighteous thing.—As for " TRUTH it endureth and is always strong; it liveth " and conquereth forevermore. With her there is no " accepting of persons or rewards; but she doeth the " things that are just, and refraineth from all unjust " and wicked things; and all men do well like of her " works: neither in her judgment is any unrighteous- " ness; and she is the strength, kingdom, power, and " majesty, of all ages. Blessed be the God of TRUTH. " —Great is TRUTH, and mighty above all things. 1. Esd. 4. 34—41.

In the second book of Esdras we have a particular description of the *Son* of God, as of a person superior in order to the Angels:—

4. " I Esdras saw upon the mount Sion a great " people, whom I could not number, and they all " praised the Lord with songs. And in the midst of " them there was a young man of a high stature, taller " than all the rest, and upon every one of their heads " he set crowns, and was more exalted; which I mar- " velled at greatly. So I asked the angel, and said, " Sir, what are these? He answered and said unto me, " These be they that have put off the mortal clothing, " and put on the immortal, and have confessed the " name of God: now are they crowned, and receive " palms. Then said I unto the angel, What young " person is it that crowneth them, and giveth them " palms in their hands? So he answered and said unto " me, It is the SON OF GOD, whom they have con- " fessed in the world. Then began I greatly to com- " mend them that stood so stiffly for the *Name of the* " *Lord*. Then the angel said unto me; Go thy way, " and tell my people what manner of things, and how

" great wonders of the Lord thy God, thou hast seen." 2 Esd. 2. 42—48.

In another place this same Esdras calls our Saviour by name, and expressly says, that he should die :—

5. " For my SON JESUS," says God, " shall be re-
" vealed with those that be with him, and they that re-
" main shall rejoice within four hundred years. After
" these years shall my SON CHRIST die, and all men
" that have life." 7. 28, 29.

6. " If I have found grace before thee, send the
" HOLY GHOST into me; and I shall write all that
" hath been done in the world since the beginning." 14. 22.

The book intitled Ecclesiasticus was written about 200 years before Christ.

The author of it seems to have thought it was the LOGOS who conversed with Moses upon mount Sinai :—

7. " He made him to hear his voice, and brought
" him into the dark cloud, and gave him command-
" ments before his face, even the law of life and know-
" ledge, that he might teach Jacob his covenants, and
" Israel his judgments." Ec. 45.. 5.

The angel, which appeared to Joshua, is understood by him to have been the Lord himself :—

8. " He called upon the *most high Lord* when the
" enemies pressed upon him on every side, and the
" *great Lord* heard him. And with hailstones of
" mighty power he made the battle to fall violently
" upon the nations, and in the descent he destroyed
" them that resisted, that the nations might know all
" their strength, because he fought in *the sight of the*
" *Lord*, and he followed *the* MIGHTY." Ec. 46. 5, 6.

The miracles wrought by Elias, the Author of this book, refers to the agency of the LOGOS :—

9. " By the WORD OF THE LORD he shut up the
" heaven, and also three times brought down fire.
" O Elias, how wast thou honoured in thy wonderous
" deeds! and who may glory like unto thee; who
" didst

" didst raise up a dead man from death, and his soul " from the place of the dead by *the* WORD OF THE " MOST HIGH?" Ec. 48. 3, 4, 5.

That is a remarkable passage where he calls *God* a *Father*, and is much in the spirit of several expressions in the Old Testament:—

10. " I called upon the LORD, the FATHER of MY " LORD." Ec. 51. 10. Compare Ps. 110. 1.

The second book of Maccabees was not written till about an hundred years before the birth of our Saviour. There is one passage in it where the Author seems to have considered the appearance of God to the assistant of the Jews in battle, as a real and visible appearance; consequently, as the *Father* never did appear, it must have been the LOGOS.

11. " So every man praised toward the even that " glorious LORD, saying, Blessed be he that hath kept " his own place undefiled. So that fighting with their " hands, and praying unto GOD with their hearts, they " slew no less than thirty and five thousand men; *for* " *through the* APPEARANCE OF GOD they were greatly " cheered." 2 Mac. 15. 27, 34.

The WISDOM OF SOLOMON was written by an unknown author, a little before the time of our Saviour, as is generally supposed. It contains several passages descriptive of the dignity both of the *Son* and *Spirit* of God. We will produce some of them in the order in which they are found in the book:—

12. " Into a malicious soul WISDOM shall not enter; " nor dwell in the body that is subject unto sin. For " the HOLY SPIRIT of discipline will flee deceit.—*The* " SPIRIT *of the* LORD filleth the world." Wisdom 1. 4, 5, 7.

13. " WISDOM, which is the worker of all things, " taught me; for in her is an understanding spirit, " holy, one only, manifold, subtil, lively, clear, unde- " filed, plain, not subject to hurt, loving the thing that " is good, quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do

" good, kind to man, stedfast, sure, free from care,
" having all power, overseeing all things, and going
" through all understanding, pure and most subtil spi-
" rits. For wisdom is more moving than any moti-
" on: she passeth and goeth through all things by
" reason of her pureness. For she is the breath of the
" power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the
" glory of the Almighty: therefore can no defiled
" thing fall into her. For she is the brightness of the
" everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power
" of God, and the image of his goodness. And be-
" ing but one, she can do all things: and remaining in
" herself, she maketh all things new; and in all ages
" entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of
" God, and prophets. For God loveth none but him
" that dwelleth with wisdom. For she is more beau-
" tiful than the sun, and above all the order of stars:
" being compared with the light, she is found before
" it. For after this cometh night; but vice ſhall not
" prevail against wisdom." 7. 22—30.

Then, after these and many other things said of WISDOM, he proceeds to pray for the blessing:—

14. " O God of my fathers, and Lord of mercy,
" who hast made all things with thy word. Give me
" WISDOM that sitteth by thy throne, and reject me not
" from among thy children: WISDOM was with thee:
" which knoweth thy works, and was present when
" thou madest the world, and knew what was accept-
" able in thy sight, and right in thy commandments:
" O send her out of thy holy heavens and from the
" throne of thy glory, that being present she may
" labour with me, that I may know what is pleasing
" unto thee. For she knoweth and understandeth all
" things, and she shall lead me soberly in my doings,
" and preserve me in her power. And thy counsel
" who hath known, except thou give WISDOM, and
" send thy HOLY SPIRIT from above." 9. 1, 4, 10,
11, 18.

After

After this prayer he informs us, that every thing which has been done in the world that is excellent has been done by WISDOM. It was WISDOM that preserved Adam, Noe, Abraham, and many others.

15. "Thine INCORRUPTIBLE SPIRIT, *O Lord*, is in "all things." Wis. 12. 1.

16. Again:—"For it was neither herb, nor mol- "lifying plaister that restored them to health; but "thy WORD, O Lord, which healeth all things." 16. 12.

It is probable, I think, that this account of Wisdom is not a bare personification, but that the Holy Spirit, the third subsistence in the Divine Nature, is the person signified.

17. "Thine ALMIGHTY WORD leapt down from "heaven, out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man of "war into the midst of a land of destruction." Wis. 18. 15.

Baruch is supposed by some to have been written about 600 years before the birth of Christ, but others place it even later than that event.

His sentiments, however, concerning our blessed Saviour are much the same with the rest of his countrymen:—

18. "This is our God," says he, "and there shall "none other be accounted of in comparison of him. "He hath found out all the way of knowledge, and "hath given it unto Jacob his servant, and to Israel "his beloved. Afterward did HE SHEW HIMSELF UP- "ON EARTH, AND CONVERSED WITH MEN." Ch. 3 35—37.

PART FIFTH.

SECTION II.

The opinions of Philo, and other *ancient* Jews, concerning the *plurality* of the DIVINE NATURE.

SOME other learned men among the Jews, and Commentators upon the Old Testament, who wrote before, or near to, the times of our Saviour, have spoken largely and strongly concerning the dignity of Messiah, and the distinctions in the Divine Nature. I will mention such as have occurred in the course of my reading. We will begin with Philo.

PHILO was one of the most learned of all the ancient Jews. He flourished, as we are informed by Eusebius, in the reign of the emperor Caligula, and was therefore contemporary with the Apostles. This father of Ecclesiastical history gives him an excellent character. He says, "He was a man of great eminence "with the generality, not merely of our Christian brethren, but also of such as have been bred in Gentile "literature. In his descent," continues Eusebius, "he was a Hebrew, and yielded to none of those at "Alexandria, who were distinguished for their consequence. What and how great advances he made "in the knowledge of the divine and his country's "religion, is evident to all from his works: and, in the "philosophic and liberal parts of Gentile literature, I "need not say how great he was: for studying with "peculiar zeal the discipline of Plato and Pythagoras, "he is reported by history, to have surpassed all his "contemporaries."[a]

This learned man hath said many extraordinary things in

[a] Eccl. Hist. b. 2. c. 4.

in his writings concerning the Divine Nature;[9] a few of which I will now proceed to lay before the reader in one view.

19. "The DIVINE LOGOS—is the power which also "made the world, having the True Good for his foun-"tain."[1]

20. "That invisible and intellectual Being, the "DIVINE LOGOS and the LOGOS OF GOD, he (Moses) "calls the image of God; and the image of this im-"age that intellectual light which was made the image "of the DIVINE LOGOS, who has explained the gene-"ration of it: and it is a super-celestial star, the foun-"tain of the sensible stars, which not improperly one "may call *Universal Light*, from which the sun, and "the moon, and the other wandering and unwandering "stars draw, according to the power of each, their "proper splendors of that pure and unmixed light, "which is darkened over when it begins to turn in the "transformation, from intellectual to sensible."[2] This is somewhat in the spirit of St. John, who calls the LOGOS the true light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world. Ch. 1. 9.

21. "Every man is related to the DIVINE LOGOS "in his understanding; being made the express image "of the blessed Nature, or a particle of it, or a radia-"tion from it."[3]

22. "The shadow of God is his LOGOS, whom he "used as his instrument in making the world."[4]

23. "The DIVINE LOGOS is very sharp sighted, "even

[9] "The Jews themselves, finding every thing in Philo so agree-"able to the notions, that their ancestors had in his age, do own "them (his writings) to be the writings of a Jew, and of Philo in "particular; as we see in Manasseh Ben Israel, who in many "places urges his authority; and (in Exod. p. 137.) shews, that "his opinions do generally agree with those of their most ancient "authors." Allix's Judgment, p. 78.

[1] p. 4.——[2] p. 6.——[3] p. 32.——[4] p. 79.

" even to be a Being sufficient for the inspection of all " things." [5] See Heb. 4. 12, 13.

24. " My soul said to me, *With that only true God* " there are *two supreme and first powers*, namely, *good-* " *ness* and *power*, and that by the *first* all things are " made; and by the *second* all things that are made, " are governed." [6] These declarations are perfectly in the spirit of the New Testament.

25. " He is the cause of thy participating in good " or evil—who is the rudder—holder and governor of " the universe, the DIVINE LOGOS." [7] Compare Col. 1. 16, 17.

26. " By his LOGOS God made all things." [8] Compare John 1. 3; Col. 1. 16; and Heb. 1. 2, 10.

27. When *God*, attended with his *two principal* " *powers*, *government* and *goodness*; himself, who is one " only, being between them, he framed three concep- " tions in the contemplative soul; each of which can " by no means be comprehended, for his *powers* are " unlimited, they each contain the whole." [9]

28. " The *supreme God* is superior to *these powers of* " *his*, and is to be seen *without* them, and appears *in* " them." [1] Compare Mat. 28. 19, and 2 Cor. 13. 14.

29. This learned man upon citing the words of David, *The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not therefore want*, immediately adds: " Every one ought to say as " much as this for himself. For every friend of God " is obliged to compose such another hymn as this; " nay, the whole world ought to do so. For God go- " verns all this universe as a shepherd does his flock, " or a king his people, over-ruling and managing the " earth, water, air and fire, and whatever any of these " do contain, whether vegetables or animals, things " mortal or spiritual; and particularly the heavens " above, the revolutions of sun and moon, and the " harmonious dances of the other luminaries and stars. " All these does God govern according to justice and law,

[5] P. 92.—[6] P. 112.—[7] P. 114.—[8] P. 131.—[9] P. 139.—[1] Ibid.

" law, having ſet over them his own righteous LOGOS, " who is his FIRST-BORN SON, and who takes upon " himſelf the care of this ſacred flock as vicegerent of " this great king. Therefore it is ſaid, Ex. 23. 20, " *Behold, I ſend my* ANGEL *before thee to keep thee in* " *the way:* therefore let the whole world ſay, We are " the great and admirable flock of the TRUE GOD; " the Lord feeds me, and therefore nothing ſhall be " wanting to me." [2] Compare Is. 40. 10, 11, and Heb. 1. 3.

30. " This world is the younger Son of GOD, as " being a ſenſible object; for he mentioned not the " SON that is older than this, and he is an *intellectual* " *Being*; and he, conſidering himſelf as worthy of elder- " ſhip, thought proper to abide with God himſelf." [3]

31. " Him the FATHER of exiſtence produced as his " eldeſt SON, whom at other times he has named his " FIRST-BEGOTTEN; and who indeed on being gene- " rated, in imitation of his FATHER's ways, and looking " upon his archetypal patterns, moulded forms." [4]

32. " If none of us be worthy to aſſume the title of " SON of God, yet do thou thy endeavour to be adorn- " ed, as is the FIRST-BORN LOGOS of God, the moſt " ancient *Angel*, even the *Archangel* who hath many " names, namely, the *beginning*, and the *name* of God, " and the Logos, and the *man* according to *his image*, " and the *ſeeing Iſrael*. Therefore I was induced be- " fore to commend thoſe who refer their original to " him. For if we are not worthy to be eſteemed the " children of God, yet we may lay claim to this, that " we are the children of the moſt holy LOGOS, who is " his ETERNAL IMAGE. For the moſt ANCIENT WORD " is the IMAGE of GOD." [5] It ſeems from this paſſage that Philo conſidered all the Divine appearances record- ed in the Old Teſtament as having been made by the

[2] P. 195.—[3] P. 298.—[4] P. 329.—[5] P. 341.

Logos of God, as indeed he more fully expreſſes it in other places.

33. "The FATHER of all things is in the *middle*, "who in the ſacred writings is by his proper name "called, HE THAT IS: but on *each ſide* are the POWERS, "which are moſt ancient and neareſt to him that is, one "of which is called the *Creative*, the other the *Royal* "*Power*. The creative Power is called *God*; for by it he "hath placed and ſet in order all things; and the *Royal* "*Power* is called *Lord*; for it is right that the *Maker* ſhould "govern and command that which is made. He therefore "who is in the *middle*, being attended by *each* of *his* "*Powers*, repreſents to the intelligent mind the appear-"ance ſometimes of ONE, ſometimes of THREE."[6] From whenceſoever this learned Jew had his intelligence, here is an evident reference to the three Perſons and one God of the Old Teſtament; which doctrine is more fully diſplayed by our Saviour and his Apoſtles in the New.

34. Speaking of the cherubim on the mercy-ſeat as ſymbolical repreſentations of what he calls the creating and governing powers, he makes this additional reflection:—"The DIVINE Logos is above theſe, of whom "we can have no idea by the ſight, or any other ſenſe; "he being himſelf the *image* of God, the eldeſt of all "intelligible beings, ſitting neareſt to him who is truly "THE ONLY ONE, there being no diſtance between "them; and therefore he ſays, *I will ſpeak unto thee* "*from the mercy-ſeat between the two cherubim*; there-"by repreſenting the Logos, as the charioteer by whom "the motion of theſe powers is directed; and himſelf "who ſpeaks to him, as the rider, who commands the "charioteer how he is to manage the reins."[7]

35. "But this excellent gift the Father of all things "hath beſtowed upon the PRINCE OF ANGELS, the "moſt

[6] P. 367.

[7] P. 465. See alſo Dodd. on the firſt of St. John's Goſpel.

" moſt ancient WORD, that ſtanding in the *middle*, he " might judge between the creature and the Creator; " and he always ſupplicates the immortal God for " mortals, and is the ambaſſador from the ſupreme " King to his ſubjects; and in this gift he rejoices, as " highly valuing himſelf upon it; ſaying, I ſtood in the " middle, between you and the Lord, as being neither " unbegotten as God, nor yet begotten as you; but " am a middle between the extremes, and a pledge for " both; for the creature with the Creator, that he ſhall " not wholly apoſtatize from him, ſo as to prefer diſor- " der before order and beauty; for the Creator with the " creature, to give him an aſſured hope, that the moſt " merciful God will never abandon his own workman- " ſhip; for I declare peace to the creature from him " who makes wars to ceaſe, even God, who is the King " of peace." [8]

36. " The holy LOGOS enjoins to ſome what they are " to do, as a king; others acquainted with him he " profitably inſtructs as their maſter; ſome as a coun- " ſellor he leads into the beſt advice; others, who of " themſelves know not what is good for them, he great- " ly aſſiſts. To ſome as a friend he ſpeaks gently, by " perſuaſion brings them into knowledge of great ſe- " crets, ſuch as the profane are not admitted to. And " ſometimes as he ſpoke to Adam he aſks, *Where art* " *thou?*—He called Moſes out of the buſh, ſaying, " *Moſes, Moſes*; who anſwered, *What is it?*" [9]

37. " There are two temples of God, one indeed " this world, in which his FIRST-BEGOTTEN, the DI- " VINE LOGOS, is alſo high-prieſt; and the other the " rational ſoul." [1]

38. Speaking of the breaſt-plate of the high-prieſt he ſays, " The four rows, each of which comprehends

[8] P. 509. Here is clearly the doctrine of the *one Mediator between God and men, the man Chriſt Jeſus.*

[9] P. 593, 594.—[1] P. 597.

" three precious ſtones, repreſent the oracle of the " Logos. For it was neceſſary that the prieſt, in the " ſupplications to the almighty Father of the world, " ſhould therein make uſe of his *infinitely perfect* Son, " as *paraclete*, in order thus to obtain an amneſty of ſins, " and a ſupply of deſirable good things." [2] *We have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our ſins.* 1 John 2. 1, 2.

39. " The Logos is the *character* of God—the " *image* of God—the *bread* and *food* which God hath " given to the ſoul—the houſe of the Father in which " he dwells—he is the divine word—the governour of " all things—the viceroy of the great King—the inſtru- " ment by whom God made the world—all light is " from this *Word*—he is the moſt ancient *Son* of the Fa- " ther of the univerſe—the *firſt-born Son* of God." [3] All theſe expreſſions are more or leſs confirmed by the holy ſcriptures. I am far from ſaying that every thing this learned man has advanced is exactly conformable thereunto: but, I believe, the Reader will agree with me, that his views of the ſacred Trinity, and the ſeveral offices the Father, Son, and Spirit ſuſtain in the ſcheme of man's redemption, are much clearer than might have been expected. [4]

Euſebius has given us the ſentiments of the ancient Jews pretty much at large in ſeveral of his works. The Evangelical Preparation and Demonſtration abound with much valuable and curious information. I will ſelect a few paſſages on the ſubject of our preſent enquiry. They will throw much light upon the opinions of the ancient ſynagogue.

40. " Examine alſo concerning the *Second Cauſe*, " whom the oracles of the Hebrews teach to be the " Logos *of God*, and to be God off God; as we our- " ſelves

[2] P. 673.—[3] Philo's Works, paſſim.

[4] See Jamieſon's Vindication, part 1. chap. 1. for a good account of the doctrine of Philo.

" ſelves too have been inſtructed in theology. Moſes " then does expreſsly give us the theology of two *Lords*, " when he ſays, *And the* LORD *rained from the* LORD " *fire and brimſtone* upon the city of the ungodly. " There he hath familiarly made an equal application to " both the two, of the characters among the Hebrews. " And this is that theology, which is unſpoken by them " in the four elements. In concert with him does " David, another prophet likewiſe, and king of the " Hebrews, ſpeak, *The* LORD *ſaid unto* MY LORD, *Sit* " *thou on my right hand*; indicating the MOST HIGH " GOD by the *firſt* LORD, and the SECOND *to him* by " the SECOND appellation. For to whom elſe is it " lawful to ſuppoſe the right hand to be conceded by " the ungenerated Deity; except to him alone, of whom " we are ſpeaking? Whom the ſame prophet in another " place more plainly manifeſts to be the LOGOS of the " *Father*, holding him forth in his Theology to be the " FABRICATOR of the univerſe; when he ſays, *By the* " LOGOS *of the Lord were the heavens eſtabliſhed.*" [s]

Theſe ſentiments are perfectly conſiſtent with the general views of the Chriſtian fathers, and with thoſe doctrines in our day uſually deemed orthodox. Again,

41. " The oracles among the Hebrews, after the " *uncauſed* and *ungenerated* perſon of the God of all, " which is unmixt and beyond all comprehenſion; in- " troduce a *ſecond* perſon and *divine* power, the *Princi-* " *ple* of all created things, ſubſiſting the firſt, and ge- " nerated out of the Firſt Cauſe; calling it the LOGOS, " and the WISDOM, and the POWER, of God.—David " celebrates the LOGOS of God, who fabricated the uni- " verſe.—And this DIVINE LOGOS the holy ſcripture " introduces at different times, as ſent by the Father for " the ſafety of men: and therefore reports him to have " ſhewn himſelf to Abraham, to Moſes, and the other " prophets who were dear to God, and to have taught " many

[s] P. 312—313.

" many things by oracles, and to have foretold things " to come; when it mentions God and the Lord, to " have appeared to and converſed with the prophets.— " Well then does the very wiſe Moſes ſay,—beginning " the coſmogony with *him*, *In the beginning God created* " *the heaven and the earth.* With *him*, he introduces " God in the creation of man, as communing with his " domeſtic and *firſt-begotten* Logos; when he writes, " *And God ſaid, Let* US *make man after* OUR *image and* " OUR *likeneſs.* To this alſo, the Pſalmiſt alluded, " when, in diſcourſing of the Firſt Cauſe, he ſays, *He* " *ſpake and they were made*, he *commanded and they were* " *created*; placing the order and command of the *Firſt* " Cauſe oppoſed to the *Second*, as of the *Father* to the " *Son.* Truly it is ſelf-evident, that he who ſpeaks " it to another, and he who commands any thing com- " mands it to another beyond himſelf. And Moſes ex- " preſsly mentioning both the *two Lords*, namely, the *Fa-* " *ther* and *Son*, thus reports concerning the puniſhment " againſt the ungodly, *And the* LORD *rained from the* " LORD *brimſtone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah.* In " harmony with which, David ſays in his Pſalms, *The* " LORD *ſaid to* MY LORD, *Sit thou on my right hand.*" [a] Theſe being the opinions of the ancient Jews as well as Chriſtians, it is no mean authority for our interpretation of the ſeveral paſſages of ſcripture here referred to.

42. The opinions of the Hebrews concerning God, the *Firſt* Cauſe of the univerſe, continued.

" Thus has Moſes begun his theology: " *In the* " *beginning God created the heaven and the earth.* Then " he ſays, *God ſaid, Let there be light, and there was* " *light.* And again, *God ſaid, Let there be a firmament,* " *and it was ſo.* And again, *God ſaid, Let the earth* " *bring forth graſs—and it was ſo.* And again, *God* " *ſaid, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven* " —*and*

[a] P. 188—190.

" —*and it was ſo.*—Such indeed is the theology re-
" ceived among the Hebrews, which teaches all things
" to have been framed by the *fabricating* Logos of
" God. And it afterwards informs us, that the whole
" world was not left thus deſolate by him who framed
" it, as an orphan left by a father; but is for ever go-
" verned by the Providence of God: ſo that God is
" not only the Fabricator and Maker of the whole,
" but alſo the Preſerver, and Governour, and King, and
" Ruler; preſiding continually over the ſun itſelf, and
" the moon, and the ſtars, and the whole heaven and
" the world; with his great eye and divine power
" inſpecting all things, and being preſent to all things
" heavenly and earthly, and directing and governing all
" things in the world.—Concerning the framing of the
" world; concerning the turns and changes of the
" whole, the ſubſtance of the ſoul, and the fabrication
" of the ſeen and unſeen nature of all rational beings;
" and concerning the Providence over all; and con-
" cerning what are yet above theſe, the *Firſt Cauſe* of
" all, and the theology of the *Second*; and concerning
" other things, that are comprehenſible by the under-
" ſtanding alone; the Hebrews have wound their diſ-
" courſes and their theories, well and accurately round:—
" that we may know, the univerſe is not ſpontaneouſly
" directed, or hath been always exiſting at random
" and by chance, from an irrational guidance; but is
" conducted by the CHARIOTEER of God, the LOGOS,
" and is governed by the power of unſpeakable *Wiſ-*
" *dom.*" [7] This extract is much in the ſpirit of the former, and aſcribes the creation, preſervation, and government of the univerſe to God and his Powers; that is, to ſpeak in the language of Chriſtian theology, to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Further,

43. " A TRIAD ſhines, a MONAD reigns in each."
" Would not this then be a ſpeech the moſt worthy of
" God,

[7] P. 186, 187, 307.

" God, of the rational and all-wiſe power of God, to " refer the principle of the framing of the univerſe, " rather to the very WISDOM and the very LOGOS of " God, than to the elements that have no ſouls and no " reaſon? For ſuch indeed among the Hebrews, were " the opinions concerning the PRINCIPLE of all things. " And let us ſee alſo what they teach, concerning the " framing of the rational beings, that are after the " FIRST PRINCIPLE." Again,

44. " After the UNCAUSED and UNGENERATED *perſon* " of GOD, the univerſal King, they tell us of a *Principle* " that was generated from no other than the Father, " being the *Firſt-begotten, the Co-adjutor* of the Father's " council, and imaged after him; which *Principle* pre- " ſides over all the things, that were afterwards created; " for which reaſon alſo, they have been accuſtomed to " call it the IMAGE of God, and the POWER of God, " and the WISDOM of God, and the LOGOS of God, " yea, and even the GENERAL of the hoſt of the Lord, " and the ANGEL *of the Grand Council*:—the POWER " of the God of all, which is great without bounds and " beyond expreſſion, taking in all things at once; and " the *Second* after the Father, being the equally fabri- " cating and enlightening power of the DIVINE LOGOS. " Wherefore alſo the Hebrews love to name him, both " the *true Light* and the *Sun of righteouſneſs*: there " being likewiſe, after the *Second* perſon, a *Third*—the " HOLY GHOST, which very *Being* they rank in the " firſt and royal dignity and honour of a PRINCIPLE of " the univerſe; he himſelf being conſtituted by the " Maker of all, a Principle of the things created after- " wards, I mean of the things that were inferior and " want aid from him. But this *Being*, holding the " *third* rank, aſſiſts thoſe who are inferior to him with " his better powers; yet indeed receives not the powers " from any other, than from the GOD LOGOS, who is " truly higher and better, and whom we have ſaid to be " the *Second* to the MOST HIGH, and the ungenerated

" perſon

" perſon of God the univerſal King: from whom even he " himſelf, the God Logos, receiving aid and drawing " Divinity, as from a perpetual and over-flowing foun- " tain of Divinity, communicates the ſplendours of his " domeſtic light to all, as well as to the Holy Ghost " himſelf, who is nearer to him than all, and very nigh, " and to the intelligent and divine powers after him, " abundantly and without envy: and that the ungene- " rated *Principle* of the univerſe, being the fountain of " all Good, of Divinity, and Life and Light, and the " cauſe of every virtue; and being the *Primary* of the " *Primaries*, and the *Principle* of *Principles* and rather " beyond the *Principle* and the *Firſt*, and every imagi- " nation ſpoken or apprehended; communicated to the " *Firſt-begotten* alone, all whatever he held involved in " his unſpeakable powers, as to him who alone was ca- " pable of taking in and receiving that, which is not to " be attained or taken in by others, the abundance of " the Father's Goods; and affords them in part to thoſe " who are partially worthy, by the miniſtry and media- " tion of the Second One, as every perſon can attain: " of which the perfect and the highly ſacred things, were " imparted by the Father himſelf to the Third One, " the *Ruler* and *Governour* of them below, who through " the Son receives the things of the Father. And from " hence all the Divines of the Hebrews, after the God " over all, and after his *Firſt-begotten* Wisdom, deify " the Third and Holy Power, calling him Holy " Ghost; by whom alſo thoſe were enlightened, who " were inſpired by God." [s] This paragraph is extreme- ly remarkable, full, and ſatisfactory. Every ſenti- ment may not be exactly conformable to the views of the goſpel; but the leading principles are ſurpriſ- ingly conſentaneous thereunto. The fundamental principles of true religion have been the ſame in all ages.

[s] P. 191—192.

45. "The *eternal* WORD of the everlaſting God is "the ſtrongeſt and firmeſt ſupport of the univerſe." [9]

46. Euſebius tells us, that "all the Hebrew Divines "do acknowledge, after the *moſt high* GOD, and after "his *firſt-born* WISDOM, a THIRD *holy power*, whom "they call the HOLY GHOST, affirming him to be GOD, "by whom the prophets were inſpired." [1] This is the ſame ſentiment we have extracted at large from the works of this learned man.

47. The ſame Euſebius has given us ſome account of a *Dramatic* poem written by a Jew named Ezekiel, who lived about two hundred years before our Saviour. In this poem God is introduced holding a dialogue with Moſes from the burning buſh. And from this dialogue it appears, that the ancient Jews conſidered the *Being*, who appeared upon that awful occaſion, as the LOGOS, and that the ANGEL, who deſtroyed the firſt-born of Egypt, was the ſame perſon. Moſes ſays:—

"Stop, what is this appearance from the buſh?
"A prodigy beyond the faith of men.
"Sudden the buſh is flaming with much fire,
"But green upon it every leaf remains.
"How's this? I'll go, and view with nearer eye
"This prodigy too mighty for belief."

The Almighty then addreſſes him:—

"Stop, O moſt worthy, nor approach thou near,
"O Moſes, till thy foot-ſtring thou haſt loos'd;
"For holy is the ground on which thou ſtand'ſt,
"And from the buſh the *heavenly* LOGOS ſhines.
"Be bold, my ſon, and liſten to my words:
"To ſee my face is all-impoſſible
"For mortal man: but thou may'ſt hear my words.
"To utter them I'm come, I am the God
"Of thoſe thou call'ſt thy fathers, Abraham,
"Iſaac,

[9] Euſeb. Præp. Evan. l. 7. c. 13.
[1] Scott's Chriſtian Life, vol. 3. notes at the end.

" Iſaac, and Jacob in ſucceſſion third.
" Remembering them, and my donations too
" I'm here to ſave my Hebrew race of men;
" For I have ſeen my ſervants grief and toil.
" But go, and in my words announce again,
" Firſt to the very Hebrews all at once,
" Then to the king, what is by me enjoin'd;
" That out of Egypt thou ſhalt bring my race."

Then ſubjoining ſome lines in return, Moſes himſelf ſpeaks:—

" I'm not by nature form'd an orator,
" My tongue is often ſtubborn to my will,
" And gives a heſitation to my voice;
" I cannot therefore ſpeak before the king."

Then God anſwers him thus:—

" Send for thy brother Aaron inſtantly,
" Then tell him all which thou haſt heard from me;
" And he ſhall be the ſpeaker to the king."

And Ezekiel introduces God ſpeaking thus concerning the wonders:—

" For three whole days a darkneſs I will give;
" Locuſts I'll ſend, which all around ſhall eat
" The fruits of man, and e'en the verdant leaf;
" And, added to all this, my hand ſhall ſlay
" The firſt-begotten child of every houſe.
" But thou ſhalt tell my people, when at eve
" They ſacrifice the paſchal lamb to God,
" That they ſhall touch their outer doors with blood;
" And the DREAD ANGEL, ſeeing, ſhall paſs by."

48. He alſo gives us a remarkable teſtimony to the doctrine of the *Divine Logos* from Ariſtobulus, a learned and philoſophic Jew, who lived an hundred and fifty years before the birth of our Saviour:—" Theſe are," ſays

ſays this learned man, "Ariſtobulus's words concerning "the SECOND CAUSE. And let this be transferred alſo "to the WISDOM: for all light is from it. Wherefore "ſome alſo (of the Jews) have ſaid, being of the ſect "of the Peripatetics; that this has the office of a lamp, "for they who follow it continually, ſhall through all "their life remain without trouble. But one of our "progenitors, Solomon, more plainly and more beauti-"fully ſaid, that *it exiſted before the heavens and the "earth.*" [1]

49. Again:—"Pythagoras, and Socrates, and Plato, "ſeem to me to have ſurveyed all (the law of Moſes) "with a curious eye, and to have followed him in ſay-"ing, that the materials of the univerſe heard the voice "of God; all accurately believing it to be made by "God, and to be inceſſantly bound together by him. "And Orpheus alſo, in his poems on the things ſaid to "him according to the SACRED WORD, declares thus "concerning all nature having been made, and being "now preſerved, by the Divine power; and concerning "God being over all. And he ſays thus:—

50. "To whom I ſhould, I'll tell (but, ye profane,
"Shut cloſe the doors, and fly the juſt man's laws)
"That rule divine, which is to all propoſed:
"And thou attend, the ſon of Mene bright,
"Muſæus; for ſome ſolemn truths I'll ſpeak:
"Nor let what is already in thy breaſt,
"Rob thee of this delightful age to come.

"On the DIVINE LOGOS look, approach him near,
"To him direct thy intellect and heart,
"Walk firmly in his path, and gaze upon
"The ſole, th' immortal MAKER of the world:
"For all the ancient LOGOS ſhines in him.
"He is the ONE conſummate in himſelf,
"And all things take their finiſh'd form from him.
"With them he is encircled; nor can any
"Of mortal ſpirits ſee him, for he is

[1] P. 190, 191.

"By

" By the mind only to be ſeen at all.
" But he from good educes never ill
" To mortal men; though love and hate attend him,
" Famine, and war, and much-lamented woes.
" Nor is there other one; and all you'll ſee
" At once, if firſt you ſee him here on earth.
" To you, my ſon, I'll ſhew him, when I view
" The ſteps and ſtrong hand of the mighty God.
" But him I ſee not; for around him ſpreads
" A thick dark cloud, and from me hides the reſt;
" While tenfold darkneſs hides him from mankind.
" Of tribe-form'd men no one ſhall ſee him reign,
" But he alone, who was a branch broke off
" From the high ſtem of the Chaldean race;
" And who was ſkill'd in the ſun's orb and path,
" How round the earth it forms its circle juſt,
" And on its ſpindle moves exactly true;
" How through the air, and through the deep of waves,
" It guides the winds, and flames a blaze of fire.
" But fix'd the Logos is in ample heav'n,
" There mounted on his golden throne he ſits,
" And reſts his feet upon the earth below.
" To ocean's bounds his right hand he has ſtretch'd;
" The hills are trembling to their baſe within,
" His wrath's dread weight unable to ſuſtain.
" But ſtill to heav'n his perſon he confines,
" And thence performs whate'er he wills on earth;
" Having within himſelf at once the end,
" The midſt, and the beginning of all things.
" As the great Logos of the ancient times,
" Who is of matter to be born, ordain'd;
" I've had the law all folded up from God:
" Or elſe I ſhould not dare to ſpeak of it.
" E'en now I ſhake through all my ſhuddering limbs,
" Though from the ſky, I know, he reigns o'er all.
" But, O my ſon, do thou theſe thoughts receive,
" A ſacred ſilence keep concerning them,
" And in thy boſom lay them ſafely up." Such

Such are the ſentiments we learn from the collections of this worthy man. The Jews obtained their ideas concerning the Divine Nature from the Law and the Prophets, and, poſſibly, from certain traditional information alſo, handed down from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, and from Abraham to Moſes. The Heathens, probably, gathered what they knew of the Divine Logos, either from the ſame ſources, or from the connections they ſometimes formed with the Jews diſperſed through the nations.

The Teſtaments of the twelve Patriarchs are ſuppoſed by the learned Cave to have been written about the year 192. They contain ſeveral declarations concerning the dignity of our bleſſed Saviour, which are in perfect accordance with thoſe of the reſt of the ancient Jews:—

51. "The Lord ſhall raiſe up out of Levi one for a "High-prieſt, and out of Judah one for a King, who "ſhall be GOD and MAN."[1]

52. The Teſtament of Zebulon ſays:—"After theſe "things the Lord himſelf ſhall riſe upon you, a light "of righteouſneſs; and healing and mercy ſhall be on "his wings: he ſhall redeem all the captives of the "ſons of men from Beliar, and every ſpirit of error "ſhall be trampled down; and he ſhall turn all the na-"tions to an emulation of himſelf, and ye ſhall ſee GOD "IN THE FIGURE OF MAN."[2]

53. The Teſtament of Nephthali declares, that thro' "Judah ſhall ariſe ſalvation to Iſrael, and in him ſhall "Jacob be bleſſed; for, through his ſceptre, ſhall ap-"pear GOD *dwelling among men on earth*, to ſave the "race of Iſrael."[3]

54. The Teſtament of Aſhur ſays:—"The MOST "HIGH ſhall viſit the earth, even *he himſelf coming as a* "*man, eating and drinking with men*, and calmly bruiſ-"ing the head of the ſerpent by water; he ſhall ſave "Iſrael, and all the nations, GOD *in the maſk of* MAN."

55. The

[1] Sect. 7.—[2] Sect. 9.—[3] Sect. 8.—[4] Sect. 7.

55. The Teſtament of Benjamin contains theſe remarkable ſentiments:—"Then ſhall we alſo riſe, each "one on his ſceptre, *worſhipping* the KING *of heaven, "who appeared upon earth in the form of man in a ſtate "of humiliation*; and as many as believed on him upon "earth, ſhall rejoice together with him. And all ſhall "riſe, theſe indeed to glory, but thoſe to diſhonour. "And the Lord ſhall judge Iſrael firſt, even for their "iniquity to him, becauſe they believed not in GOD, "*when he came to them in the fleſh as a deliverer*; and "then ſhall he judge all the nations, as many as believed "not in him, when he appeared upon earth."[5]

56. R. Jonathan paraphraſes—*and the* SPIRIT *of God moved on the face of the waters*, "the Spirit of mercies, "who is from before the Lord, ſtanding upon the face "of the waters."[6]

57. Bereſchit Rabba, ſpeaking of the SPIRIT that moved upon the face of the waters, expreſsly affirms, "This is the SPIRIT of Meſſiah the King."[7]

58. The author of the Jewiſh book called the Zohar, who is ſaid to have been Rabbi Simeon, has many expreſſions which have a plain alluſion to a plurality in the Divine Nature. We read, for inſtance, that "he called Rabbi Eleaſar his ſon, and made him ſit "down by him, and Rabbi Abba his ſcholar on the "other ſide of him; and then ſaid, *We are now the "TYPE of all that is.*"

59. Again:—"I ſay, that all the lamps are lighted "from one lamp, which is the ſupreme one, and alto-"gether latent.—All the lights are united in one; the "*ſecond light is in the firſt light, and the other light in the "ſame. They light through one and other, and are undi-"vided one from the other.*—For *he* and his *name* are "*one*. For the King himſelf is the moſt inward light; "and that light which makes manifeſt is called his "garment

[5] Sect. 10.

[6] See Scott's Chriſtian Life, vol. 3. notes at the end.—[7] Ibid.

" garment. Now there are *two lamps* which ſhine " from the KING's *throne within*; and they are called " *juſtice* and *judgment*. Theſe are the beginning and " conſummation of all things, by whom all things both " above and below are crowned, and theſe are ſometimes " called *Melchiſedec*, that is, the King who is the *king* " *of righteouſneſs and king of peace.*"

60. Again:—" None knows the Supreme Wiſdom " but himſelf. He enjoys one uninterrupted tenure of " joy, and is unchangeable in his mercy and goodneſs " to eternity. This moſt *Ancient and holy One* reveals " himſelf as one that has THREE HEADS, which are yet " all within ONE HEAD. He himſelf is the SUPREME " HEAD properly, that includes the THREE HEADS. " But in another reſpect he is denoted by a TRINITY; " and all the lamps which ſhine are included in this " TRINITY."[8]

61. R. Simeon Ben Joachi in the Zoar ſpeaks in this manner: " Come and ſee the myſtery of the word " ELOHIM: there are three degrees, and every de- " gree by itſelf alone; and yet notwithſtanding they " are all one, and joined together in one; and are not " divided one from another."[9]

62. Rittangelius, who had been a Jewiſh Rabbi, but was converted to Chriſtianity, has attempted to prove from the book Tykunim, and other talmudical tracts, that the *ancient* Jews owned theſe things in relation to the Meſſiah, namely, that " he is the SUPREME " WISDOM, proceeding from the Father by eternal and " ineffable generation—that he is the true Saviour of " mankind—that in order to this he muſt deſcend into " this world—that by the power of the HOLY SPIRIT " he muſt aſſume an human body, and be united to " the human nature—that he must die for the redemp- " tion

[8] See more to the ſame purpoſe in Fleming's Chriſtology, p. 136, &c. where ſome account is given of this ancient Jewiſh author.

[9] Ainsworth on the first of Geneſis.

" tion of men, and then go down into the place of " the dead—that he muſt free the ſouls of men from " the ſlavery of the devil—that he muſt riſe again from " the dead, and aſcend into heaven—and that he must " judge the world at laſt." [1]

63. Again:—" There is a man—who is not ſimply " called a man, but the firſt man, and the ſupreme of " all men; the ſupreme crown, the hidden and occult " —the cauſe of cauſes, the beginning of all begin- " nings. Of this firſt man it is ſaid, *Then I was by* " *him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily* " *his delight; rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in* " *the habitable part of his earth, and my delights were* " *with the ſons of men.* And to this firſt man it was " ſaid, *Let* US *make man in our image, after our likeneſs.* " So that this man is the WISDOM," &c. [2]

64. The Jewiſh book called Imre Binah informs us, that " there are THREE *prime and primordial heads,* and " *co-eternal,* and this their own light teſtifies; and the " intellectual numerations do eternally teſtify the TRI- " NITY of the King." [3]

65. Moſes the ſon of Nehemannus, who lived in the twelfth century, gives the following account of the Meſſias, as he is quoted by Maſius upon the fifth chapter of Joſhua. " That *Angel,* to ſpeak the truth, is " the ANGEL REDEEMER, of whom it is written, *be-* " *cauſe my name is in him*; this, I ſay, is that *Angel,* " who ſaid unto Jacob, *I am the God of Bethel.* He " is alſo that *Angel,* of whom it is ſaid, *And God called* " *to Moſes out of the buſh*; for he is called the *Angel,* " becauſe he governs the world; wherefore it is writ- " ten, JEHOVAH, that is, *the* LORD GOD, *brought us* " *out of Egypt.* And elſewhere, *He ſent his* ANGEL " *and brought us out of Egypt.* Beſides, it is written,

[1] De verit. Rel. Chriſt. p. 45, &c.
[2] Ibid. p. 54.
[3] Rittangelius in Jezirah, p. 3 and 36.

" *And the* ANGEL *of his face saved them.* Of this AN-
" GEL it is also said, *My presence shall go before the*
" *camp of Israel, and shall cause it to rest.* Laſtly,
" this is the ANGEL of whom the prophet speaks,
" *The Lord, whom ye ſeek, ſhall ſuddenly come to his*
" *temple; the* ANGEL *of the covenant, whom ye desire.*"[4]

66. The Jewiſh book Reſchit Chocmah says, " There are *three Gods*, as it is explained in the words " of the book Zohar. R. Joſe ſaid, What is the " the meaning of thoſe words, Deut. 4. 7. to whom " the *Gods* are near, whereas it ſhould have been ſaid, " to whom *God* is near; but there is the *ſuperior God*, " there is the *God of the fear of Iſaac*, and there is the " *inferior God*; and ſo they are ſaid to be *Gods* that " are near."[5]

67. Another Jewiſh book, entitled Midraſch Tillim, makes mention of " THREE *proprieties* or *perſons by* " *whom the world was made.*"[6]

68. R. Phineas ſaith, that " the HOLY SPIRIT " reſted upon Joſeph from his youth till the day of " his death."[7]

69. Again:—" After they were all ſlain," ſaith the ſame Rabbi, " the HOLY SPIRIT reſted twenty years " upon Ezekiel in Babylon, and led him forth into the " valley of Dora, and ſhewed him a great number of " bones."[8]

70. Some ancient Cabaliſts diſtinguiſh God into " THREE LIGHTS, which ſome of them call by the " ſame names we Chriſtians do, namely, FATHER, " SON, or Word, and HOLY GHOST."[9]

71. And

[4] See Scott's Chriſtian Life, vol. 3. notes at the end.
[5] Voiſin. in Procem. Pug. Fid.
[6] Martin Raimund, Pug. Fid. p. 396.
[7] See Scott's Chriſtian Life, vol. 3. Notes at the end.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Grotius de Veritate.—This great man hath given us his opinion of theſe matters in various parts of his writings. In the book before us he ſays, " There is no more reaſon why the worſhipping

71. In Tanchuma, a famous book among the Jews, is a passage to this effect; that Jesus Christ, whom they call wicked Balaam, *taught that he was* GOD: and R. Tanchuma argues, that he was a mere man.[1]

72. In the grand council of Jews assembled at Ageda in Hungary, A. D. 1650, they easily agreed to these three particulars. 1st. That the Messiah will appear as a great conqueror, and deliver them from all foreign yoke. 2dly. That he will alter nothing in the Mosaic religion. 3dly. That he will be *born of a virgin*; and that this his miraculous birth is to be a characteristic by which he shall be known to those who are strangers to the covenant.[2]

73. The learned Jews know well, that that prayer,

" many Gods ſhould be objected againſt the Chriſtians, than againſt " Philo the Jew, who often affirms that there are three things in " God; and he calls the Reaſon or Word of God, the Name of " God, the Maker of the world; not unbegotten as is God the " Father of all; nor yet begotten in like manner as men are. The " ſame is likewiſe called the Angel, or the Ambaſſador, who takes " care of the univerſe, by Philo himſelf; and by Moſes the ſon " of Nehemannus: Or againſt the Cabbaliſts who diſtinguiſh God " into *three lights*, and ſome of them by the ſame names as the " Chriſtians do of the FATHER, SON, or Word, and HOLY " GHOST. And to take that, which is chiefly allowed amongſt all " the Hebrews: That Spirit by which the prophets were moved, " is not any created thing, and yet is diſtinguiſhed from him that " ſent it; as likewiſe that which is commonly called the *Shechinah*.

" Now many of the Hebrews have this tradition, that that Divine " power, which they call *Wiſdom*, ſhould dwell in the Meſſiah " whence the Chaldee paraphraſt calls the *Meſſiah*, the WORD OF " GOD; as the Meſſiah is alſo called by David, and others, by " the venerable name of GOD, and alſo of the LORD."

Book 5. ſect. 21.

[1] Allix's Judgment, p. 430.

[2] Univerſal Hiſtory, vol. 11. p. 142. See Jamieſon's Vindication, vol. 1. p. 88, 89, where it appears the Jews had ſome notion their Meſſiah ſhould be miraculouſly conceived. To this purpoſe they applied Jer. 31. 21, where it is ſaid, *The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman ſhall compaſs a man.* This is a ſtrong preſumptive argument that Dr. Blayney is miſtaken in giving a different meaning to the paſſage. See his tranſlation of the place, and compare Pearſon on the Creed, Art. 3. p. 171.

which in the Christian countries is called the prayer against the Sadducees, and in other countries the prayer against the Minnim, the heretics and apostates, was truly and originally written against the *Christians*, for being teachers of a TRINITY, and of *Christ's* DIVINITY. This prayer was composed under R. Gamaliel, who died, A. D. 52.[3]

74. In that wretched fiction of Jewish malignity, which is entitled *Tholedoth Jesu*, or the Generations of Jesus, a kind of anti-gospel, published by Huldrik; they state our SAVIOUR and his DISCIPLES to have *taught*, that he was GOD, born of a VIRGIN, who had conceived him by the HOLY GHOST.[4]

75. Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, lived in the apostolic age. He, though an unbeliever, has spoken of our blessed Saviour as being a person very extraordinary. If the passage is genuine, it seems to imply, that even those who rejected the mission of our Saviour, had some suspicion he was more than a mere man:—"Now," says he, "there was about this time "*Jesus*, a wise man; if it be lawful to call him a man: "for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of "such men as receive the truth with pleasure.—*He was* "*Christ.*"[5]

76. Dr. Lightfoot gives us the articles of a believing Jew's creed collected out of the law of Moses, in the manner following:

1. "I believe that salvation is by faith, not by works.

2. "I believe that there is no salvation without re-"conciliation with God, and no reconciliation without "satisfaction.

3. "I believe that satisfaction shall once be made.

4. "I believe that satisfaction for sin shall be made "by a man.

"5. I

[3] Allix's Judgment, p. 431.

[4] Whit. Origin of Arianism Disclosed, p. 7.

[5] The genuineness of this passage has been questioned by several respectable scholars.

5. " I believe that he shall be more than a man.

6. " I believe that the Redeemer must also be God " as well as man.

7. " I believe that man's Redeemer shall die to make " satisfaction.

8. " I believe that he shall not die for his own sins, " but for man's.

9. " I believe that he shall overcome death.

10. " I believe to be saved by laying hold upon his " merits." [6]

Nothing can be clearer from all these teſtimonies, than that the Jews, prior to, and about the time of, our Saviour, entertained ideas of a *triplicity* in the DIVINE NATURE. [7]

[6] Works, vol. 1. p. 713.—See Bradley's Impartial View of the Truth of Chriſtianity, p. 156.

[7] This is fully proved by Dr. Allix in the learned work before ſo often mentioned, and granted by a celebrated Socinian of the laſt age. He says in his Hiſtorical Vindication of the Naked Goſpel, that the Platonic enthuſiaſm crept firſt into the Jewiſh, afterwards into the Chriſtian church. Then he tells his readers how the Jews picked up their Platoniſm; of which he says, the principal doctrines were two; the one, that of the pre-exiſtence of ſouls; the other, that of the Divine Trinity. These, he says, were the opinions of the Jews in the days of our Saviour and his Apoſtles. See Biſhop Horsley's Tracts, p. 217.

The learned reader will find the ſame thing treated profeſſedly, and with great ability, by Galatinus in his twelve books De Arcanis Catholicæ Veritatis. The doctrine of the Cabbaliſts is treated at large by Reuchlinus in his three books De Arte Cabbaliſtica.

PART SIXTH.

SECTION I.

Opinions of the HEATHEN concerning the PLURALITY of the DIVINE NATURE.

WE proposed in the next place to produce the opinions of the learned Heathen concerning the nature of the Divine Being. Much satisfactory information, one should suppose, could not be expected from this quarter. Their ideas cannot be very distinct upon a subject so deep and mysterious as that of the SACRED TRINITY. Unassisted reason can afford little information here. All their knowledge of the subject must have been derived from tradition, from the writings of Moses and the Prophets,[8] or from conversation had with the Jews in their dispersion. How they came by their intelligence we know little for certain. Certain, however, it is, that the Gentile nations were no strangers to the *distinctions* in the GODHEAD at a very early period of the world. Their notions of this kind are to be traced so far back; that we are lost in the abyss of time, and can only say, that the Heathens were possessed of the idea of a *distinction* in the DEITY from time immemorial.[9] And this is a strong presumption,

[8]—"What Socrates said of him, what Plato writ, and the rest "of the Heathen philosophers of several nations, is all no more "than the twilight of revelation, after the sun of it was set in the "race of Noah." Dryden's Preface to his Religio Laici.

It would be easy to prove, were this a place for it, that most of the learning, which was cultivated among the Heathen, was derived, either from tradition, or from revelation. Their mythology was little more than a corruption of sacred history. Whoever is disposed to see this question throughly elucidated will find considerable satisfaction from the perusal of Bochart's Phaleg et Canaan, Cudworth's Intellectual System, Gale's Court of the Gentiles, Millar's Propagation of Christianity, Banier's Mythology, Bryant's Ancient Mythology, Maurices's Indian Antiquities, and History of Indostan, and other writings of a similar kind.

[9] "The Philosophers of all nations seem to have had some "idea, more or less confused, of a certain *triplicity* in the supreme

tion, that the doctrine of the TRINITY was either an original revelation to mankind, or that the writings of Moses and the Prophets have been interpreted, right or wrong, as containing some information concerning it. Be this as it may, the most early notice we have from the Heathen of a *plurality* of *persons* in the *Divine Nature* seems to be derived from the eastern countries, where the descendents of Noah first settled. Chaldea and Egypt were the original sources of it. Into one or both of these countries the Learned of ancient times usually travelled, to gather what information they were able concerning arts, laws, policy, things human and divine. In these literary peregrinations the Grecian Sages take the lead. Orpheus, Pythagoras, Homer, Plato, and other celebrated persons returned from these Universities of the world, full fraught with learned stores: and from Greece, that small, but celebrated country, they disseminated the seeds of religion, liberty, and laws, through all the neighbouring nations, the benefits of which we enjoy at this day. [1]

1. Zoroaster

" *Unity.* Christianity has unfolded this ancient doctrine. It teaches " us, that in the *Divine Essence* there is a *triple distinction* of FA- " THER, SON, and HOLY SPIRIT; that the actions of the one " are not the actions of the other; that the FATHER exists of " himself, independently, as the primitive source of DEITY; that " the SON comes forth from the FATHER by an incomprehensible " *generation*: and the HOLY SPIRIT from both by an inconceive- " able *procession*; and lastly, that these *two emanations* from the " *Divinity* are *necessary, co-eternal, con-substantial, infinite*, and in " all things *equal to the* FATHER, his *independance only* excepted." Ramsay's Discourse upon the Theology and Mythology of the Pagans, p. 172.

[1] There is a good general view of the sentiments of the Heathen concerning the TRINITY in Reeve's edition of Chamber's Cyclopædia, which I shall transcribe in these notes for the satisfaction of those persons, who are not possessed of that great Work, and who yet wish to be acquainted with the first principles of things. " Many " of the Heathen," says this vast repository of science, " seem " to have had a notion of a Trinity. Steuch. Eugub. de Peren. " Philos. lib. 1. cap. 3. observes, that there is nothing in all " theology more deeply grounded, or more generally allowed by " them, than the mystery of the TRINITY. The Chaldæans, " Phœnicians, Greeks, and Romans, both in their writings, and

1. Zoroaster seems to have been the first in the eastern countries, who entertained an idea of THREE PRINCIPALS existing in the Divine Nature. He lived in a very early period of the world, but when, it is not certain. His opinions are, indeed, delivered in very obscure terms; but in terms sufficiently clear to establish the proposition before us, that the Heathen nations had

" their oracles, acknowleged that the SUPREME BEING had begot
" another Being from all eternity, which they sometimes called the
" SON OF GOD, sometimes the WORD, sometimes the MIND, and
" sometimes the WISDOM OF GOD, and asserted it to be the crea-
" tor of all things.

" Among the sayings of the Magi, the descendents of Zoroaster,
" this is one, Παντα εξετελεσε πατηρ και νω παρεδωκε δευτερω——The FATHER finished all things, and delivered
" them to the SECOND MIND. The Egyptians called their TRI-
" NITY, *hemptha*, and represented it by a globe, a serpent, and a
" wing, disposed into one hieroglyphic symbol. Kircher, Gale,
" &c. suppose the Egyptians learned their doctrine of a TRINITY
" from Joseph and the Hebrews.

" The philosophers," says St. Cyril, " owned THREE *hypos-*
" *tases*, or persons; they have extended their divinity to THREE
" *persons*, and even sometimes used the word TRIAS, TRINITY:
" they wanted nothing but to admit the consubstantiality of the
" THREE *hypostases*, to signify the *unity* of the Divine Nature, in
" exclusion of all *triplicity* with regard to difference of nature; and
" not to hold it necessary to conceive any inferiority of hypostases.

" We learn from Dr. Cudworth, that, besides the inferior Gods,
" generally received by all the Pagans, viz. animated stars, dæmons,
" and heroes, the more refined of them, who accounted not the
" world the supreme deity, acknowledged a TRINITY of divine
" hypostases superior to them all. This doctrine, according to
" Plotinus, is very ancient, and obscurely asserted, even by Par-
" menides. Some have referred its origin to the Pythagoreans, and
" others to Orpheus, who adopted THREE PRINCIPALS, called
" *Phanes*, *Uranus*, and *Cronus*. Dr. Cudworth apprehends, that
" Pythagoras and Orpheus derived this doctrine from the theology
" of the Egyptian Hermes, and, as it is not probable, that it
" should have been first discovered by human reason, he concurs
" with Proclus in affirming, that it was at first a theology of divine
" tradition or revelation, imparted first to th[illegible]lebrews, and from
" them communicated to the Egyptians and [illegible]er nations; among
" whom it was depraved and adulterated. [illegible]w. Intell. System,
" b. 1. ch. 4.

" Plato, and some other of his followers, s[illegible]k of a TRINITY

had an idea of a TRINITY from time immemorial. The following are some of the oracles of this celebrated man, or his disciples, which have come down to our own times:—

"Where the *paternal* MONAD is.
"The MONAD is enlarged which generates Two.
"For the DYAD sits by him, and shines with intellectual sections.
"For in the whole world there shines a TRINITY, of which an UNITY is the head.
"This order is the beginning of all section;
"For the *mind* of the FATHER commanded, that all things be cut into THREE.
"Whose will assented, and then all things were divided:
"For the FATHER perfected all things, and delivered them over to the SECOND MIND, which the whole race of men call the first."

These, with several other oracles, are delivered down to us, as the sayings of this Chaldaic philosopher, by the Grecian writers.[2] Most of them are obscure

 enough

"in such terms, that the primitive fathers have been accused of "borrowing the very doctrine from the Platonic school; but T. "Mourgues, who has examined the point asserts, that nothing can "be more stupid than to suppose the Platonic TRINITY brought "into the church; and to have recourse to the Platonism of the "fathers to discredit their authority with regard to this dogma."
Article Trinity.

[2] "It is certain, that long before Christianity appeared in the "world, there was a very ancient tradition, both among *Jews* and "*Heathens*, concerning THREE *real differences or distinctions* in the "DIVINE NATURE, very nearly resembling the Christian doc-"trine of the TRINITY.—Where this tradition had its original is "not easy, upon good and certain grounds, to say; but certain it is, "that the Jews anciently had this notion: and that they did dis-"tinguish the WORD of GOD, and the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD, "from HIM, who was absolutely called GOD, and whom they look-"ed upon as the *first principle* of all things; as is plain from Philo "Judæus, and Moses Nachmanides, and others cited by the learned "Grotius in his incomparable book of the Truth of the Christian "religion." Tillotson, Sermon 48.

enough to be sure; but that which declares, "In the "whole world there shines a TRINITY, of which an "UNITY is the principle," is very remarkable, and has generally been understood as conveying a strong idea of the doctrine of the HOLY and UNDIVIDED TRINITY by Christian divines. Nor is the last less remarkable, which asserts, that "the FATHER perfected all "things, and delivered them over to the SECOND "MIND."[3]

2. Among the ancient Persians we find some indubitable traces of the doctrine of a TRINITY, in their THREE *great deities*, OROMASDES, MITHRA, and AHRIMAN. This was the Persian TRIAD, of which MITHRA was the *middle God*, and called the MEDIATOR.

This notion of the Persian TRINITY is confirmed by a passage in Plutarch in his treatise de Iside et Osiride, where he declares—"Zoroaster is said to have made "a THREEFOLD distribution of things: to have assigned the *first* and *highest* rank to OROMASDES, who, in "the oracles, is called the FATHER; the *lowest* to "AHRIMANES; and the *middle* to MITHRAS, who, in "the same oracles, is called THE SECOND MIND."[4]

3. The Egyptians called their TRINITY *Hemptha*, and represented it by a *globe*, a *serpent*, and a *wing*, disposed into one hieroglyphic symbol, according to the custom of that country. Some persons have supposed, that they learned their doctrine of a TRINITY from Joseph, and the ancient Hebrews, who resided so long among them.[5]

One

[3] For some account of Zoroaster, see Stanley's History of Philosophy, part 19, p. 2.—For his opinions, see Cudworth's True Intellectual System, p. 286, &c.—And, for the authority of the Chaldean Oracles, see also the same learned author, p. 292, &c. and Bishop Bull's Primitiva et Apostolica Traditio de Jesu Christi Divinitate, cap. 4.

[4] See Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 713—735.

[5] "The Egyptians asserted but one supreme, unmade Deity, yet "agreeably to the Orphic, the Pythagorean, and Platonic TRIAD, "which, it is very probable, was derived from them, they hold

One of the most remarkable representations of the *triune* God that is now known is to be seen in the cavern of Elephanta, one of the moſt ancient and venerable temples in the world. It is very large, and

 composed

" a kind of TRIPLICITY or TRINITY in the same *Divine Eſ-*
" *ſence*, whoſe ſeveral hypoſtaſes, or perſons, they diſtinguiſhed by
" ſome one or other of theſe names, *Hammon*, *Neith*, *Iſis*, *Serapis*,
" *Eicton*, *Emeph*, or *Cneph*, and *Phtha*. The *firſt* whereof was an
" indiviſible *unity*, which they termed EICTON; the *ſecond* a per-
" fect mind converting its intellections into itſelf, which they
" termed EMEPH, o CNEPH; the *third* an immediate principle of
" generation, which they called by any of the other names, ac-
" cording to its ſeveral powers, as *Hammon*, *Oſiris*, *Phtha*, and the
" like. Accordingly Athanaſius Kircher tells us, that in the Pam-
" philian obeliſk, that firſt hieroglyphic of a winged globe with a
" ſerpent coming out of it, was the Egyptian hieroglyphic of a
" TRIFORM DEITY, or TRINITY of *divine hypoſtaſes*; which
" he confirms by the teſtimony of Abenephius an Arabian writer,
" and a Chaldaic fragment imputed to Sanchuniathon; the GLOBE
" being ſaid to ſignify the *firſt* incomprehenſible Deity, ſelf-exiſt-
" ent, and without beginning or end; the SERPENT ſignifying the
" *divine wiſdom* and creative virtue; laſtly the WINGS denoting
" that active ſpirit, which cheriſheth, quickeneth, and enliveneth
" all things. To this account have ſubſcribed St. Cyril, A. Sten-
" chus Eugubinus, &c. the latter citing for this purpoſe this paſ-
" ſage out of Damaſcius, that, according to the Egyptians, the
" firſt principle of all was darkneſs, above all knowledge and un-
" derſtanding, or unknown darkneſs, they *thrice* repeating the
" ſame." Wiſe's Abridgment of Cudworth, p. 102. See Cud-
worth himſelf, p. 413, &c.

The very learned Michaelis alſo obſerves, that " the Egyptian
" philoſophers did not fall in with all the ſuperſtition of the peo-
" ple, but worſhipped one ſupreme and firſt God, whom they called
" in Greek ΕΙΣ, THE ONE. Jamblicus in his book de Myſ-
" teriis Ægyptorum, ſect. 8. c. 2. writes thus concerning the
" Deity;" ' Before all things that exiſt, and before the firſt original
' beings' (" meaning the ſpirits who created the world") ' there
' is one God.—He is prior to the firſt God' ("meaning his Son")
' and to the King; he is moveable, and continues in the ſolitude
' of his unity.' " This only God was worſhipped far and near in
" the eaſtern countries, and they intermixed ſuperſtition in their
" worſhip of him."——

" Jamblicus writes of him in the place before quoted"—' From
' this ONE, that God who is his own original kindled himſelf;
' wherefore he is alſo called his own Father, and his own Origin.'

composed of THREE HEADS united in ONE BODY, dedicated to the CREATOR, PRESERVER, and REGENERATOR of mankind.[6]

4. Mercury Trismegistus, who lived very early, says, "The will of God contained his WORD."

Again:—"God, with his WORD produced another "INTELLECT, which is a fiery God, and a DIVINE "SPIRIT."

Again:—"The WORD of God compacted the pure "workmanship of nature."

And again:—"The working INTELLECT together "with the WORD."[7]

5. Orpheus, the Thracian, lived about 1200 years, more or less, before our Saviour. He, likewise, speaks more fully and distinctly of the Divine Nature, than could be expected, at so early a period. How he came by his information, we are no where informed for certain. He strongly, however, asserts THREE *principals* in the GODHEAD, and calls the *second* THE DIVINE WORD, AND IMMORTAL KING.[8]

Again:

("A Christian cannot assert the eternal divinity of the Son of God "in stronger terms.") 'For he is the original Being, and the God 'of gods, One of One, before any thing existed, and before the 'beginning of existence. For from him comes the possibility of 'being, and being itself, whence he is also called the beginning of 'things imaginable.' Introduc. Lectures to the N. T. sect. 100.

The curious reader would do well to consult Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. page 690, &c. where he will find a fuller account of the Egyptian TRINITY.

[6] See a plate of this image in Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 1st. with some account of it in the same work, vol. 4. p. 736, &c.

[7] Lightfoot's Works, vol. 1. p. 393.—Note. The remains of Trismegistus are supposed by some persons to be spurious, little dependence, therefore, can be placed upon his evidence.

[8] See Leslie's Socin: Controv. p. 257; and Cudw. Intel. Syst. p. 305 and 546, &c.

Ramsay informs us, that "the doctrines of the primitive per-"fection of nature, its fall and its restoration by a DIVINE HERO, "are equally manifest in the Mythologies of the Greeks, Egyptians, "Persians, Indians, and Chinese."

Discourse, p. 217.

Again:—" I adjure thee, O heaven," said he, " the " work of the mighty and wise God: I adjure thee, " the VOICE of the FATHER, which he first spoke, " when he established the whole world by his coun- " sels." [9]

And again: " All things were made by ONE GOD- " HEAD in THREE NAMES, and this God is all things." [1]

6. Pythagoras, who flourished near 600 years before the birth of Christ, spoke much concerning THREE PRINCIPALS, and is supposed to have learned the doctrine from the Egyptian priests, amongst whom he lived twenty two years; or else from the followers of Zoroaster in the East, where he resided twelves years. [2]

7. Epicharmus, the Pythagorean philosopher, lived about 450 years before the Christian æra, yet he speaks of the LOGOS in very strong terms as the author of reason to man:—

" If men have powers of reason, they have too
" The heavenly LOGOS: for life's changeful scenes
" Was reason planted in the frame of men;
" The heavenly LOGOS waits on all their arts,
" Himself suggesting what they ought to do:

For

[9] Justin Martyr, p. 16.

[1] See Maurice's Ind. Ant. vol. 4. p. 702.—" It is clear," says the learned Jamieson, " that Orpheus asserted a TRINITY, " under the names of Phanes, Uranus, and Chronus; one of these " he called προτογονος Θεος *the first begotten God.* Wolfius " asserts from Damascius, that Orpheus introduced a TRI- " FORM deity. Timotheus, the chronographer, affirms, that Or- " pheus had long ago declared, that all things were made by a " *co-essential* or *consubstantial* TRINITY. He uses the three names, " LIGHT, COUNSEL, and LIFE; and asserts, that by these " THREE all things were made. He also speaks of the DIVINE " WORD, and recommends a fixed adherence to it."

Vindication, vol. 1. p. 25.

[2] " He was the chief propagator of that doctrine amongst the " Greeks, concerning THREE HYPOSTASES in the DEITY."—— Cudworth's Intell. System, p. 22. See this subject discussed in the same excellent work, p. 373, &c. and p. 546, &c. more at large, and with admirable learning and ability.

" For man invented not a single art,
" For 'tis the God who first produces it;
" And man's own reason planted was in man,
" By the great Logos and his hand divine."[3]

8. Parmenides was a Greek philosopher of the Pythagorean sect, who flourished at Elis about 440 years before Christ. Plotinus tells us, that he was one of them that asserted the TRIAD *of divine hypostases.*[4]

9. Socrates

[3] See Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius's Evang. Prepar. But the above translation is taken from the learned Mr. Whitaker's Origin of Arianism Disclosed, p. 128, 129.

[4] See Cudworth's Intell. System, p. 386, &c. and p. 546, &c. See also the same learned Work, p. 22.—I will subjoin what this very skilful Divine has advanced in a sort of compendium in the preface: "There was," says he, "a double Platonic TRINITY; "the one spurious and adulterated, of some latter Platonists; the "other true and genuine, of Plato himself, Parmenides, and the "Ancients. The former of which, though it be opposed by us to "the Christian Trinity, and confuted; yet betwixt the latter and "that, do we find a wonderful correspondence; which is largely "pursued in the Platonic Christian's Apology: Wherein notwithstanding, nothing must be looked upon as dogmatically asserted "by us, but only offered and submitted to the judgment of the "learned in these matters; we confining ourselves in this mysterious point of the Holy Trinity within the compass of those its "Three Essentials declared:—First, That it is not a Trinity of "mere names and words, or of logical notions only; but of Persons or Hypostases: Secondly, That none of those Persons or "Hypostases are creatures, but all uncreated: And, Lastly, That "they are all Three, truly and really One God. Nevertheless "we acknowledge, that we did therefore the more copiously insist "upon this argument, because of our then designed Defence of "Christianity; we conceiving, that this parallelism, betwixt the "ancient or genuine Platonic, and the Christian Trinity, might "be of some use to satisfy those among us, who boggle so much "at the Trinity, and look upon it as the choak-pear of Christianity; "when they shall find, that the freest wits amongst the Pagans, "and the best philosophers, who had nothing of superstition to "determine them that way, were so far from being shy of such an "hypothesis, as that they were even fond thereof. And that the "Pagans had indeed such a Cabbala amongst them (which some "perhaps will hardly yet believe, notwithstanding all that we have "said) might be further convinced, from that memorable relation

9. Socrates speaks of a person whom he expected to appear upon earth to instruct mankind; one that should enlighten their minds; and one that should have a wonderful readiness and willingness to make men virtuous, whom he even calls the DIVINE LOGOS.[5]

10. Eupolis, in his Hymn to the Creator, has the same ideas:

" And yet a greater hero far
" (Unless great Socrates could err)
" Shall rise to bless some future day,
" And teach to live, and teach to pray.
" Come, unknown instructor, come!
" Our leaping hearts shall make thee room:
" Thou with Jove our vows shalt share,
" Of JOVE and THEE we are the care."

It should seem from hence (if this is a just translation, for I have not seen the original) that the Heathen expected the person, who was to come into the world to instruct mankind in the will of God, was to be more than

" in Plutarch, of Thespesius Solensis, who, after he had been look-
" ed upon as dead for three days, reviving, affirmed amongst other
" things, which he thought he saw or heard in the mean time in his
" ectasy, this, *Of Three Gods in the form of a triangle, pouring in*
" *streams into one another*; Orpheus's soul being said to have ar-
" rived so far; accordingly as from the testimonies of other Pagan
" writers we have proved, that a Trinity of Divine Hypostases was
" a part of the Orphic Cabbala. True indeed, our belief of the
" Holy Trinity is founded upon no Pagan Cabbalas, but only Scrip-
" tural Revelation; it being that which Christians are, or should be,
" all baptized unto: nevertheless these things are reasonably noted
" by us to this end; that that should not be made a prejudice against
" Christianity and Revealed religion; nor looked upon as such an
" affrightful bugbear or mormo in it; which even Pagan philoso-
" phers themselves, and those of the most accomplished intellec-
" tuals, and uncaptivated minds, though having neither councils,
" nor creeds, nor scriptures; had so great a propensity and readi
" ness to entertain, and such a veneration for."

Pages 11, 12.

[5] Vide Plato. in Alcibiade et in Phœd.

than man, and was to share divine honours with the supreme Deity.

11. Plato, the most celebrated of all the Grecian philosophers, flourished about 400 years before the birth of our Saviour. He began to write when the prophets ceased in Israel. His sentiments on religion, are in the main, very pure and excellent; and his opinions on the subject now under consideration bear a striking resemblance to the doctrine of the *Christian* TRINITY.[6]

Porphyry says, that "Plato extended the *Divine Es-* "*sence* into THREE *hypostases*, the SUPREME GOD being "called *Optimus*, and after him a SECOND GOD, the "*Maker* of all things."[7]

Plato himself bids us swear "by GOD, who is the "governor of all things, and by the FATHER of him, "who is the *ruler* and the *cause*."[8]

Again:—Speaking of the Son of God, he says, "The "most DIVINE WORD framed this universe, and ren- "dered it visible. And that man, who is truly hap- "py, first admires this WORD, and is afterward in- "flamed with a desire of learning all that can be known "by a mortal nature, being convinced that this is the "only way to lead a happy life here below, and after "death to arrive at those places that are prepared for "virtue; where he shall be truly initiated and united "with wisdom, and always enjoy the most wonderful "discoveries."

Again:—Writing to Hermias, Erastus, and Coriscus, he says, "You must read my letter all three together; "and that you may profit by it, you ought to implore "the assistance of GOD, the *sovereign Lord* of all things, "that either are or shall be; and the FATHER of *this* "*Sovereign*, who is the cause of beings. If we are "truly

[6] See this matter ably discussed in Cudworth's Intellectual System, p. 546, &c. where every thing is advanced upon the subject the reader can desire.

[7] Apud Cyril. cont. Jul. l. 1. p. 34.—[8] Eph. 6. p. 1276.

" truly philosophers, we shall know *this* GOD as clearly " as blessed men are capable of knowing him.

He writes in the manner following to young Dionysius—" I must declare to Archedemus, that which is " much more precious and divine, and which you have " a very ardent desire to know; since you sent expressly " to me on that account. For, as far as I understand by " him, you do not believe I have sufficiently explained " what I think of the nature of the *first principal.* I " must write of this to you in enigmas, that if my " letter should be intercepted by sea or land, he that " reads it may not be able to comprehend any thing. " All things are round about their KING; they exist by " him, and he alone is the cause of good things: *Se-* " *cond* for *second* things, and *third* for *third.*" [9]

12. Aristotle made a declaration just before his death, concerning the reasonableness of believing, that the Gods would come down from heaven, to instruct and relieve mankind. [1]

13. Zeno, father of the Stoics, who flourished about 250 years before Christ, determines the LOGOS to be the *Creator* and *Adjuster* of every thing in nature; and affirms the same LOGOS to be called by the name of *Fate, God, Mind of Jove,* and *Necessity* of all things. [2]

He saith in another place:—" There are *two prin-* " *ciples* of all things, matter, which is the patient, and " the efficient, *God the* WORD, which being *eternal,* " goes through all matter, forming every thing." [3]

14. Some learned men have found a TRINITY of *Divine hypostases* even among the idolatrous Romans, in an early period of their state. The Romans are supposed to have received the idea from the Phrygians, the Phrygians from the Samothracians, and the Samothracians

[9] These three passages are taken from Dacier's Life of Plato, p. 139, 140.
[1] Bishop Law's Theory of Religion, p. 114.
[2] Tertullian's Apol.
[3] Apud Laert. l. 7.

thracians from the Hebrews. "The *first* of these Di-
"vine hypostases, called *Jove*, being the fountain of
"the Godhead; and the *second* of them, called by the
"Latins *Minerva*, fitly expressing the DIVINE LOGOS:
"and the *third Juno*, called the *Love and Delight* of
"Jove, well enough answering to the DIVINE SPI-
"RIT."[4]

15. Cicero says, that the most ancient of these *Cabiri*, who, according to Herodotus, had a temple at Memphis, were in number THREE, and their names *Tretopatræus*, *Eubuleus*, and *Dionysius*. They were esteemed as the THREE *mighty guardian genii* of the universe.

16. There were various other appearances of a TRIPLE DEITY to be met with among the nations of Europe in ancient times. The TRIPLE images called *Hetruscan* are proofs of this assertion. In Gaul and in Germany have been found deities in TRIPLE *groups*. And I do not know whether we may not attribute to the same tradition of a TRIUNE *God* several other classes of the number THREE among the Greeks and Romans. They had their THREE *fates*; THREE *furies*; THREE *graces*; and, according to Varro, THREE *celestial muses*.[5]

[4] See Cudworth's Intell. System, p. 450, &c. and p. 546, &c.
[5] See Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 4. p. 711, 712.

PART SIXTH.

SECTION II.

Opinions of the *more modern* HEATHEN concerning the PLURALITY of the DIVINE NATURE.

VIRGIL lived in the time of Auguſtus, and was contemporary with our Saviour. Inſtructed, as is generally allowed, by the writings of the Sybils, he hath ſpoken ſuch things of ſome extraordinary child juſt then born, as are applicable to no merely human Being:

17. "Now a new progeny is ſent from lofty heaven.—"He ſhall receive the life of Gods; and ſhall ſee "heroes mixed with Gods, and he himſelf ſhall be "ſeen of them: and he ſhall rule the peaceful world "with his Father's virtues.—DEAR OFFSPRING OF THE "GODS, THE MIGHTY SON OF JOVE."[6]

18. Seneca, the tragedian, hath nearly the ſame ideas with the above of Virgil. In ſpeaking of the primitive ſtate of the world he ſays:—"Then virgin JUSTICE, "ſpouſe of the GREAT GOD, ſent from heaven, with "holy FIDELITY, governed the earth with ſweet-"neſs."[7]

19. Seneca, the Stoic philoſopher, and tutor of Nero, emperor of Rome, was born about the ſame time with our Saviour. It appears from his *Conſolatio*, that he was no ſtranger to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. His words are, ſpeaking of the misfortune that had befallen Helvia:—"It was done, believe me, "by him, whoſoever he was that formed the univerſe, "whether *that* GOD IS THE ALMIGHTY, or whether "the

[6] See the fourth Eclogue, paſſim.
[7] Sen. Frag. Octaviæ. act. 2.

" the IMMATERIAL PRINCIPLE OF REASON, the AR-
" TIFICER of his amazing works, or whether it was the
" DIVINE SPIRIT, which is diffused through all the ob-
" jects of nature, great and small, or whether it was fate
" and the unchangeable concatination of causes mutually
" dependant." [8] Consol. ad Helviam, c. 8.

20. Pontius Pilate is said by Eusebius to have informed Tiberius, emperor of Rome, "that CHRIST was " already believed by many to be God." Eccl. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 2.

21. One of the most early and remarkable foreign testimonies, to the doctrine of the TRINITY is that of Simon Magus. Irenæus tells us, " that he was by many " glorified as God, that he taught them he was the same " indeed who appeared among the Jews as the SON; " but, in Samaria, descended as the Father; and came " into other nations as the HOLY GHOST; and that he " was the most sublime virtue, that is, he who is FA-" THER over all." [9]

Bishop Bull observes upon this strange pretension:— " From whence, I beseech you, was that blasphemous " declaration of Simon's, that he only was the SON " who appeared among the Jews, the FATHER who " descended in Samaria, and the HOLY GHOST who " came upon the Gentiles? From whence, I say, was " it

[8] " This theology with other sciences came from Egypt to India, " where at this day the doctrines of the THREE *persons* of the " DEITY in ONE *substance*, is an essential part of the creed of the " Bramins, and they call those persons by the same names that we " do, *the* FATHER, *the* SON, *and the* HOLY GHOST. The *first* " in their language is RAMA, the *second* VISNOU, and the *third*, " CRISNA. This fact is told in a French book written by one " Le Croze, entitled, Histoire du Christianism des Indes, vol. 2. " book 4. p. 48. And he relates it upon the credit of one Manuel " Godinho, a Portuguese, who was in India in the year 1663. And I " have heard the fact atteſted by an acquaintance of mine, who had " been many years in India."

Lord Monboddo's Origin and Progress of Language, vol. 5. from the Critical Review for Decr. 1791, p. 409.

[9] Adv. Hær. lib. 1. cap. 20.

" it taken, if not from the received doctrine of the " church concerning the HOLY TRINITY, GOD the " FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT?"[1]

22. In the very beginning of the second century lived the celebrated Pliny, who was a judge under the emperor Trajan, that put Ignatius to death. He had occasion to take the confessions of some revolting Christians, and he says they declared unto him, that " they were accustomed to meet on a certain day be- " fore it was light, and," among other parts of their worship, " sing an hymn to Christ as God."[2] He says farther in the same Epistle, that the contagion of this superstition had overspread not only cities, but towns and country villages. It appears from this testimony of Pliny, that the worship of Jesus Christ was common among all ranks and degrees of Christians many years before the conversion of Justin Martyr to the Christian faith.

23. Lucian, the Heathen, was contemporary with Justin Martyr, being born about the year 124. By his ridiculing the worship of the Christians of his own time, it appears very satisfactorily, what religious principles were then entertained among them. For, bringing in a Christian instructing a Catechuman, he makes the Catechuman ask this question:—" By whom shall I " swear?" And he who personates the Christian answers: " By the GOD that reigns on high, the great, immortal, " heavenly GOD; and the SON of the FATHER; and " the

[1] Prim. et Apostol. Tradit. c. 2. s. 4.

[2] Plin. book 10. Ep. 97. These hymns are called by an ancient writer, mentioned by Eusebius, l. 5. c. 28, psalms. " Psalms " also," says he, " and hymns of the brethren, written by the " faithful from the beginning, celebrate CHRIST the WORD of " God, and pronounce him GOD. Of this kind, no doubt, were " the hymns which St. Paul refers to in his Epistle to the Ep. c. 5. " 19, *speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs— " to the Lord*; that is, to Christ. *Speaking to themselves* evidently " corresponds with that alternate mode of *singing among themselves.*" Knowles's Prim. Christ. p. 33.

" the SPIRIT proceeding from the Father, ONE IN " THREE, AND THREE IN ONE. Consider this to be " your Jupiter; esteem this to be your God." [3]

Socinus rates this testimony of Lucian very highly. His words deserve our notice. " I never met with any " thing," says he, " which seems more to favour the " notion that a TRINITY of *persons* in the GODHEAD " was in that age the object of belief and worship, " than this passage from the Dialogue stiled Philopa- " tris." [4]

This is an important concession from an adversary. In another place this witty Pagan objects to the Christians " the WORSHIP of their CRUCIFIED IMPOSTOR," [5] as he blasphemously calls our blessed Saviour; a pretty good proof that he was then an object of religious adoration.

Describing, in another place, his coming into a religious assembly, he says, " He there heard that prayer, " which began with the FATHER, and ended with the " *song of many names.*" [6]

Again:—" These wretches" (the Christians) says he, " believe themselves immortal; that they ſhall live " forever; and therefore despise death, and yield them- " ſelves unto it. Their Lawgiver persuaded them that " they are all brethren; and therefore when they depart " from us, and deny the deities of the Greeks, and " WORSHIP their CRUCIFIED TEACHER, and frame their " lives conformably to his laws, they contemn riches, " have all things in common, keep their faith.—To " this day *they* WORSHIP THAT GREAT MAN CRUCI- " FIED in Palestine. Peregrinus learned that wonder- " ful wisdom of the Christians."

Another oath he has to this purpose:—" By the SON, " him who is from the FATHER, I will not tell you."

" Tell

[3] See his Philopat. prope finem.
[4] Socin. adv. Eutrop. c. 15. p. 689.
[5] In Proteo.
[6] Philopatris, p. 1128.

"Tell me," replies another, "and receive the "power of telling me from the SPIRIT."

All these testimonies from an Heathen, who lived in so early an age (for he wrote about the year 167) are extremely valuable. They must strike every attentive mind in the manner they affected the celebrated Socinus.

24. We have another testimony to the worship of Christ somewhat similar to that of Pliny. It was written by the emperor Adrian to a person who was consul in Egypt in the year 134. In this a patriarch of the Jews is said by the Emperor to have been "urged by "one party, to worship Serapis, and by another, to "WORSHIP CHRIST."[7]

25. Celsus, the celebrated Epicurean philosopher, flourished about the year of our Lord 180, and wrote against the Christians with much skill and plausibility. The work, which he entitled, "A true Discourse," is lost; but various parts of it are preserved by Origen, who returned an answer with great ability. In one of these passages Celsus, in the name of a Jew, whom he personates, charges the Christians "with finding fault "with the Jews for not believing, that CHRIST was "GOD."—

In another place he says, "We agree with you Jews, "that the WORD is the SON of GOD."[8]

He objects too to the Christians their *adoration* of our *Saviour's* GODHEAD, and an acknowledgement that CHRIST is GOD.[9]

26. "Severus Alexander designed to build a temple to Christ, and to receive him among the gods; which is reported also to have been the intention of Hadrian, who commanded temples without idols to be erected in every city: but he was restrained from his purpose by those, who, on consulting the gods, reported that, if he proceeded, all men would become Christians, and that

[7] Vid. Whitaker's Origin of Arianism disclosed, p. 277.
[8] Scott's Christian Life, vol. 3. notes at the end.
[9] Orig. contra Cel. lib. 3.

that every other temple would be deserted." This is the testimony of Ælius Lampridius, who himself was a Heathen, and strongly implies that CHRIST WAS WORSHIPPED *in the days of Severus.* He lived about 230. Ælii Lampridii Alex. Sev.

27. Numenius, a Greek philosopher of the second century, and a Pythagorean, calls the FATHER the *first*, and the WORD the *second God.* [1]

28. Plotinus, the celebrated Platonic philosopher, in the third century, speaking of the Logos, says, "This nature is GOD, even a SECOND *God.*" [2]

He affirms of the WORD, that "it is not separated "from the FIRST *God* or *Father*, but of necessity is "together with him, being separated from him ONLY "*in personality.*" [3]

"The WORD is the *Be-er*, and this *Be-er* is not a "dead *Be-er*, that is, neither life nor mind; but that "*mind*, and *life*, and *Be-er*, are the same thing." [4]

"Neither is this *Mind or Word* in power; neither "is itself one thing, and its knowledge another; but "its knowledge is itself." [5]

"The WORD is the *Son of God*, the *Child of God*, "the *full*, *beautiful Mind*, even the *Mind* that is full "of God. [6]

The same Plotinus hath treated at large of these THREE DIVINE PERSONS, whom he expressly calls, THREE PERSONS *that are* PRINCIPALS; assuring us, that these doctrines concerning this DIVINE TRINITY were not new, or of yesterday; but were anciently, though obscurely taught; and that what is now discovered concerning them is only a farther explication of them. But we have faithful witnesses that these doctrines were taught of old, and particularly in the writings of Plato himself,

[1] Apud. St. Cyril. cont. Jul. lib. 8.
[2] Enn. 5. l. 5. c. 3.
[3] Ibid. 5. l. 1. c. 6.
[4] Ibid. 5. l. 1. c. 2.
[5] Ibid. 5. l. 3. c. 5.
[6] Ibid. 5. l. 8. c. 5.

himself, before whom also Parmenides delivered them.[7]

29. Amelius, a third Platonic philosopher of the same century, who was well versed in the doctrine of the Gentiles concerning the divine Logos, casting his eyes upon St. John's description of the Son of God in the first chapter of his gospel, doth, with all confidence, pronounce this to be the sense of it:—"This "was that WORD, who, according to Heraclitus, ex- "isted from eternity, and made all things; and whom, "by Jupiter! the Barbarian (St. John) places in the "order and dignity of a PRINCIPAL, declaring him to "have been *with God*, and to be God, and that all "things were made by him; and that in him all things "that were had life and being; to have descended to "bodies, and putting on flesh, to have assumed the "form of man; to have afterwards manifested the "majesty of his nature, and returning to resume his "Godhead, and to be God, such as he was before his "descent into a body, into flesh, and into man."[8]

30. Porphyry, another famous Platonic philosopher of the same age, and a virulent enemy to Christianity, says, "The WORD is always without time, and alone "eternal."[9]

He, moreover, says, "The Christians weakly WOR- "SHIPPED CHRIST."[1]

Again:—"Since JESUS CHRIST began to be HO- "NOURED, no man has been sensible of the general and "beneficial superintendence of the gods."[2]

31. Chalcidius, a fifth Platonic philosopher, who lived at the same time with Amelius, where he explains the doctrines of the Jews, delivers this as their sense of the divine Word:—"This WORD of God is GOD "taking care of human affairs, and is the cause by

[7] Ibid. passim.
[8] Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. 2. c. 19.
[9] St. Cyril cont. Jul. l. 1, p. 32.
[1] Apud Euseb. D. E. lib. 3. c. 6.
[2] Ibid. lib. 5. c. 1.

" which men may live well and happily, if they do not " neglect this gift, which the supreme God hath " granted to them." [3]

Again:—" When that which *begat* is most perfect, " that which is *begotten* necessarily co-exists with it, so " as to differ only by personal diversity." [4]

Again:—" There is also a most venerable and holy " history, which mentions the rising of one extraordinary " Star, by which was foretold, not the diseases or deaths " of men, but the descent of a *venerable* GOD in favour " of men for the salvation of them; which Star they " testify to have been observed by the Chaldeans, who " came to this GOD newly born, and presented to him " gifts by way of honour and veneration." [5]

32. Julian, the Apostate, says of St. John, that he alone of all the Evangelists has denominated our *Saviour* GOD, and appealed to the witness of John Baptist, that it is CHRIST whom we should believe to be GOD the WORD. "The good natured John," says he in another place, " perceiving that the persuasion of Christ's " being God, prevailed greatly among the Christians dis- " persed through many cities of Greece and Italy, did " then privately take upon him to assert the same doc- " trine in his Gospel, with a view to humour them, and " get himself reputation." This is Julian's way of ridiculing the doctrine of Christ's divinity, but it shews strongly, that the Christians of the apostolic age were exceedingly zealous for the doctrine of Christ's divine nature, and that St. John's gospel, in the opinion of Julian, contains these sentiments. [6]

33. Libanius, the Orator, says with scorn, " that the " *Christians* make that *man* of Palestine both GOD and " the SON of God." [7]

34. Hierocles

[3] In Timæum Plat.
[4] Apud Euseb. P. E. l. 11. c. 17.
[5] In Timæum. Consult Maurice's Ind. Antiq. vol. 4. p. 703, &c.
[6] Vide Burgh's Sequel, p. 407, and Waterland's Importance, p. 253.
[7] Socr. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 23.

34. Hierocles says, "the Christians, because of a "few miracles, proclaim *Jesus* to be GOD."[8]

35. Proclus, a Greek philosopher, who lived in the latter end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, called the doctrine of three Divine persons subsisting in the Godhead, "The tradition of the THREE GODS, and "the *divinely delivered theology*, which teaches that this "world was completed by *these* THREE."[9]

The same Proclus quotes a Chaldæan oracle which says:—"After the *paternal mind*, I PSYCHE dwell;" which, in our language, are expressive of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*.

36. The Scandinavian religion also plainly inculcates the worship of a TRIPLE *Deity* in the mythologic persons of *Oden*, *Frea*, and *Thor*.[1]

37. The Mexican Indians likewise were found to have some imperfect ideas of a TRIPLE *Divinity*, and it is even said, that they worshipped a great idol, which signified ONE IN THREE AND THREE IN ONE.[2]

38. "The Hindoos adore THREE principal deities, "*Brouma*, *Chiven*, and *Vichenou*, who are still but ONE. "The representation of them is to be seen in many "pagodas under that of human figures with THREE "heads, which, on the coast of Orissa, they call "*Saribarabrama*; on the Coromandel coast, *Trimourti*; "and *Tretraitreyam* in the Sanscreet dialect. There "are temples entirely consecrated to this kind of TRI-"NITY; such as that of Parpenade, in the kingdom of "Travancore, where the THREE gods are worshipped "in the form of a serpent with a thousand heads."[3]

Again:—"One circumstance which forcibly struck "my attention, was, the Hindoo belief of a TRINITY. "The persons are *Sree Nun Narrin*, the *Maha Letch-*

"*imy*,

[8] Euseb. cont. Hier.
[9] In Timæum Plat. p. 93.
[1] Mallet's Northern Antiquities, vol. 1. p. 96.
[2] Acosta's Hist. of the Indies, p. 412.
[3] Sonnerat's Voyage, vol. 1. p. 4. Calcutta edit.

" *imy*, a beautiful woman, and a Serpent. These per-
" sons are, by the Hindoos, supposed to be wholly
" indivisible; THE ONE IS THREE, AND THE THREE
" ARE ONE."[4]

39. In the great empires of Tangut and Thibet, and over the vast Tartarian deserts to Siberia itself, the same sentiments concerning a TRIUNE *Deity* prevail. The Tartars and Siberians themselves adore in fact only ONE indivisible God under THREE different denominations, the FIRST signifying, the *Creator* of all things; the SECOND, the *God* of armies; and the THIRD, the *Spirit* of heavenly love, *proceeding from the two former.*[5]

40. The Chinese seem to entertain the same ideas of a TRIPLE Deity with all the rest of the nations. Lao-kiun was one of their most celebrated philosophers, and flourished about 600 years before the birth of Christ. He instituted a system of philosophical theology, in which he continually repeated as the foundation of all true wisdom, that " TAO, *the eternal rea-*
" *son, produced* ONE; ONE *produced* TWO; TWO *pro-*
" *duced* THREE; *and* THREE *produced all things.*" This seems a very evident proof, that he must have had some obscure notions of a TRINITY.*

In their original, canonical, and ancient books we find the following passages. In the book Tonchu we read these words:—" The source and root of all is ONE. *This self-existent* UNITY *produces necessarily* a SECOND; the FIRST and SECOND by their UNION produce a THIRD; in fine, these THREE produce all. Lopi, in commenting upon this passage, says, that this UNITY is TRIPLE, and this TRIPLICITY ONE.

Laotsee, in his fourteenth chapter called Tsankuen, or the elogium of hidden wisdom, says, " *He that pro-*
" *duced all, and is himself unproduced, is what we call*
" HI.

[4] See Mr. Forster's Sketches of Hindoo Mythology, p. 12.
[5] See Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 5. p. 775, 776.
* Le Compte's Memoirs of China, p. 314.

" HI. *He that gives light and knowledge to all things,* " *and is himself invisible, is what we call* YI. *He that* " *is present every where, and animates all things, though* " *we do not feel him, is called* OUEI. Thou wilt in " vain interrogate sense and imagination about these " THREE, for they can make thee no answer. Con- " template by the pure spirit alone, and thou wilt " comprehend, *that these* THREE UNITED *are but* " ONE."

Li-yong, in commenting upon this passage of Laostee, says, " HI, YI, OUEI have no name, colour, " nor figure. They are united in the same spiritual abyss, " and by a borrowed name they are called UNITY; this " UNITY, however, is not a *bare* UNITY, but an UNITY " that is TRIPLE, and a TRIPLICITY that is ONE. To " speak thus, is to understand what is most excellent " in the law of wisdom."

The book Sleeki says " The ancient emperours " sacrificed every three years solemnly to him that is " ONE and THREE."

Choueven, in commenting upon the hieroglyphic that expresses unity, says, that " in the beginning the " supreme reason subsisted in a TRIPLE UNITY, that " this UNITY created the heavens and the earth, " separated them from each other, and will at last con- " vert and perfect all things."[6]

41. We have lately had an opportunity of learning from the mutineers of the ship called Bounty, that the inhabitants of Otaheite have also some idea of a triple deity, or at least of three principal Gods. And it is remarkable, that the names of these three principal Gods are conformable in a striking degree to those which are usually given to the three persons of the Christian Trinity. One is called the FATHER; another GOD in the SON; and the third, the BIRD, the FRIEND,

[6] See Chevalier Ramsay's Philosophical Principles, vol. 2. p. 120, and Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. 5. p. 808.

FRIEND, and sometimes the SPIRIT. This information is conveyed to us by the Rev. Dr. Haweis, and laid before the public in the Evangelical Magazine for Jan. 1797, p. 23—25.

I will close these testimonies with an excellent summary of the doctrine of the more ancient Heathen on the subject of the Divine Hypostases, from the Tracts of the very learned Bishop of Rochester:—

"If it should be deemed incredible, as well it may," says this able writer, "that reason, in her utmost "strength, should ever ascend so high, as to attain "even to a distant glimpse of truths, which have ever "been esteemed the most mysterious discoveries of "Revelation: it will become a question of the highest "curiosity and importance, to determine by what "means the Platonic school came by those notions of "the Godhead, which, had they been of later date than "the commencement of Christianity, might have "passed for a very mild corruption of the Christian "faith; but being in truth much older, have all the "appearance of a near, though very imperfect view, "of the doctrine which was afterwards current in the "Christian church.

"The enquiry becomes more important, when it is "discovered, that these notions were by no means "peculiar to the Platonic school: that the Platonists "pretended to be no more than the expositors of a "more ancient doctrine; which is traced from Plato "to Parmenides; from Parmenides to his masters of "the Pythagorean sect; from the Pythagoreans to "Orpheus, the earliest of the Grecian Mystagogues; "from Orpheus to the secret lore of the Egyptian "priests, in which the foundations of the Orphic theo-"logy were laid. Similar notions of a triple princi-"ple prevailed in the Persian and Chaldean theology; "and vestiges even of the worship of a Trinity were "discernible in the Roman superstition in a very late "age. This worship the Romans had received from "their

" their Trojan ancestors. For the Trojans brought " it with them into Italy from Phrygia. In Phrygia " it was introduced by Dardanus so early as in the " ninth century after Noah's flood. Dardanus car- " ried it with him from Samothrace; where the per- " sonages, that were the objects of it, were worshipped " under the Hebrew name of the Cabirim. Who these " Cabirim might be, has been matter of unsuccessful " enquiry to many learned men. The utmost that is " known with certainty is, that they were originally " Three, and were called by way of eminence, *The* " *Great or Mighty Ones*: for that is the import of the " Hebrew name. And of the like import is their " Latin appellation, Penates. Dii per quos penitus " spiramus, per quos habemus corpus, per quos ratio- " nem animi possidemus. [7] —Dii qui sunt intrinsecus, " atque in intimis penetralibus cæli. [8] Thus the joint " worship of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, the Triad " of the Roman capital, is traced to that of the Three " Mighty Ones in Samothrace; [9] which was established " in that island, at what precise time it is impossible to " determine, but earlier, if Eusebius may be credited, " than the days of Abraham.

" The notion therefore of a Trinity, more or less " removed from the purity of the Christian faith, is " found to have been a leading principle in all the anci- " ent schools of philosophy, and in the religions of al- " most all nations; and traces of an early popular " belief of it appear even in the abominable rites of " idolatrous worship. If reason was insufficient for " this great discovery, what could be the means of " information, but what the Platonists themselves

" assign

[7] Macrob. Saturnal. l. 3. c. 4.

[8] Varro apud Arnob. l. 3. p. 123. Lugd. Bat. 1651.

[9] —Tarquinius Demarati Corinthii filius,—Samothraciis mystice imbutus, uno templo ac sub eodem tecto, numina memorata conjungit.

Macrob. Saturnal. l. 3. c. 4.

" assign, Θεοπαραδοτος Θεολογια, A Theology delivered " from the Gods, that is, A Revelation. This is the " account which Platonists, who were no Christians, " have given of the origin of their master's doctrine. " But from what Revelation could they derive their " information, who lived before the Christian, and had " no light from the Mosaic? For whatever some of " the early Fathers may have imagined, there is no " evidence that Plato or Pythagoras were at all ac- " quainted with the Mosaic writings: not to insist, " that the worship of a Trinity is traced to an earlier " age than that of Plato or of Pythagoras, or even of " Moses. Their information could be only drawn " from traditions founded upon earlier revelations: " from scattered fragments of the ancient Patriarchal " creed; that creed, which was universal before the " defection of the first idolaters, which the corruptions " of idolatry, gross and enormous as they were, could " never totally obliterate. Thus the doctrine of a " Trinity is rather confirmed than discredited by the " suffrage of the Heathen sages: since the resemblance " of the Christian faith and the Pagan philosophy in " this article, when fairly interpreted, appears to be " nothing less than the consent of the latest and the " earliest revelations."

Such is the evidence in favour of the doctrine of the HOLY AND UNDIVIDED TRINITY arising from the writings of the ancient Heathen, and the traditions and practices of the modern nations. The momentum of it appears to me very considerable, however erroneous several of their notions might be. It should seem from hence, that the doctrine is not so in opposition to reason as some of our modern philosophers would persuade us it is. It is not only scriptural and primitive, but it is philosophical. The greatest geniuses of the world have entertained it, and entertained it too, on the strictest principles of reason and nature.

It will be allowed, at least, that these testimonies are

are remarkable; and from them it is evident a tradition concerning a *triplicity* in the SUPREME BEING had pervaded all time, and all nations. This is a curious circumstance, and much to be observed in an enquiry of this nature. The Old and New Testaments unravel the whole mystery. There alone the doctrine is revealed with proper authority.

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION I.

On the utility of the writings of the CHRISTIAN FATHERS in determining the question concerning the doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY.

LET us in the last place enquire in what manner the disciples and followers of the Apostles understood the holy scriptures upon these subjects. Those persons who conversed with the Apostles, and with the immediate followers of the Apostles, stand the fairest chance of knowing the true sense of their writings.[1] I do not mean hereby to put the writings of the primitive Fathers upon the same footing as the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, which have been received in all ages, by the great body of Christians, as the undoubted word of God: but as the authors of them were some of them contemporaries, companions, disciples, or successively followers of the Apostles of our blessed Lord, it is highly probable they must contain certain traits and sentiments strongly illustrative of the doctrines of the New Testament. At all events, these great and good men must be unexceptionable witnesses of *facts*; what doctrines were taught, and what practices were followed, during the several

[1] "I am, and always shall be, afraid of interpreting scripture "contrary to the stream of antiquity, unless upon the most clear "arguments against it, a case I believe which will never happen. "The consentient judgment of primitive antiquity would surely "outweigh a multitude of probabilities and plausible reasonings." Defen. Fid. Nicæ a Bull, cap. 1. sect. 9.

"In dubious points of doctrine, the judgment of antiquity, "wherever it is clear, must be allowed to be decisive."

Bishop Horsley's Tracts, p. 8.

several ages in which they respectively lived.[a] The use then to be made of their writings, is no other than what a discreet lawyer would make of all the best contemporary authors who lived when Magna Charta was obtained. If in that celebrated Code of rights any thing appeared obscure, and difficult to be understood, he would consult the best authors of the age in which it was framed, who had written upon the same, or any collateral subject; especially would he consult contemporary authors, or those who immediately followed, if any of them had undertaken to illustrate and explain the whole, or any part, of that invaluable deed. Magna Charta is to us as Englishmen, what the Word of God is to us as Christians. The one contains a copy of our civil rights and obligations, the other of our religious privileges and duties. Nor is it any diminution of the just and absolute authority of the Word of God in our religious concerns, to consult the contemporary and subsequent writings of the Fa-

 thers

[a] The Rev. Henry Kett, in his Bampton Lectures, has given a just discrimination of the various excellencies of the Fathers, and may be read with considerable advantage. "The reader of the "Fathers," says he, "is convinced, that although the prize of "literature is borne away by the classical authors of Greece and "Rome; yet similar beauties distinguish the compositions which "are the objects of his pursuit. Neither the graces of simplicity, "nor the splendour of ornament were confined to Xenophon and "Plato, nor to Livy and Cicero; for every impartial critic will "commend the pure stile of Lactantius; the rich imagery, and "apposite illustrations of Theodoret; the classical fluency of "Minucius Felix; the uniform perspicuity of Basil; the glowing "effusions of Gregory of Nazianzum; and the exuberant and "attracting eloquence of Chrysostom and Cyprian." Sermon 1. p. 13.

See the whole of that valuable discourse. Let the reader too, who thinks meanly of the writings of the Christian fathers, consult Simpson's Strictures on Religious Opinions, towards the latter end, and he will find what have been the sentiments of a number of persons the most competent to judge, concerning the importance of the volumes these great and good men have composed for our instruction.

thers, to see how it was understood in the several ages in which they lived; any more than it would be a diminution of the just and absolute authority of Magna Charta, in our civil concerns, to consult the contemporary and subsequent writings of lawyers and civil historians, to see how it was understood in the several ages in which they lived. A conduct similar to this is what every prudent man is daily pursuing in all the common concerns and occupations of life. Accordingly, Christians in all ages, and of every denomination, have been forward to claim the verdict of the Fathers in their own behalf; and none ever set light by their testimony, but those whose principles and doctrines the writings of the Fathers condemned. It is said by an author in the early part of the present century, that Dr. Clarke rejected the authority of these primitive writers; and Dr. Waterland gives a very good reason for it:—"He is against them," says he, "because "he knows they are against him."[3]

Dr. Clarke, indeed, has made a great show and parade with the Fathers in his Scripture Doctrine; but by no means has he used them fairly and ingenuously. He has only culled out of their writings such passages as give countenance to his own particular views, as I have had occasion to observe elsewhere, but has not set before his readers what their real and genuine sentiments were upon the great subject in debate.[4] He should not have adorned his pages with their words without their sentiments, but have given us the highest expressions they are ever known to use concerning the Son and Spirit of God, as well as those which, on a partial view, seem to support his own system. Such a conduct is misleading unwary readers, and making them believe the Fathers were all on his side of the question, when

[3] Earl of Nottingham's Answer to Whiston, p. 66. 7th. Ed.

[4] See the Preface to Welchman's Examination of Clarke's Scripture Doctrine. See too Dr. Clarke's Introduction to his book, p. 19, 20, where he speaks upon the sentiments of the Fathers.

when it is well known by all competent judges that they were nothing less. By the same mode of proceeding, it is very easy to prove from the holy scriptures, that the angels are men, and that the Son of God himself is no more than a man, to the utter subversion of both the Arian and Orthodox systems. He must have known, that by producing their words so partially as he has done, one may make them appear to countenance opinions highly abhorrent to their real sentiments. Nay, there are some instances, which have been noticed by his antagonists, where he has selected words, expreſſive of the nature of the person of Christ, according to his own views, and if he had quoted the context, his whole scheme would have been subverted.[5] This was very disingenuous, and the apology he makes for it is by no means satisfactory. I could not have imagined the great Dr. Clarke (for whom I have otherwise the most sincere regard, and from whose works I have received much satisfaction) had been capable of such kind of shuffling in controversy. Such instances shew us how imperfect man is, and how little to be depended upon, even in his highest state of intellectual improvement. How would the Doctor have exclaimed against these pious frauds (which have been too common in all ages and among all denominations) in the Orthodox?[6] Let them, however, be found where they may, they are always, and in all cases, very wrong, and highly disgraceful to any cause. If I have been guilty of false representations of the words or sentiments of any the

[5] For an instance see the 31 chap. of Novatian.

[6] I am aware the Doctor profesſes to cite the words of the Fathers to shew how naturally they fell into the way of speaking which was agreeable to his views of things. They could not do otherwise, if they spoke at all of the person and offices of the Redeemer. But what I insist on, is, that he should have produced the highest expressions they ever make use of, when speaking of the person of our Saviour, and either reconcile them with his own supposition of Christ's being a mere creature, or honestly allow, that the writings of these excellent men are not in consistence with his scheme of doctrines.

of the authors, sacred or profane, which I have had occasion to quote in this enquiry, I hereby disavow the intention, make my protest against the practice, and declare that I am ignorant of it. I am very sure Christ wants no man to lie and pervert truth for the advancement of his honour. If the doctrines of the gospel cannot be defended by honest means they are not worth defending at all.

I have another objection to the learned Doctor's book. He labours all the way through it too much to degrade the persons of the Son and Holy Spirit. There seems an evident intention and endeavour of this kind. Hence he is niggardly of his praises. When any passage of scripture speaks strongly for the real and proper divinity of the second and third persons in the blessed Trinity, he strives all he decently can to lower and dilute it. If there is a various reading, he eagerly catches at it; magnifies its importance, and makes the authenticity of the passage appear as dubious as he can; though for one manuscript that favours his scheme, there shall be a dozen that favour the orthodox view of things. Now this I do not like. It is disingenuous. I would give every passage and every expression its full force and meaning, without regard to system, even though I should appear inconsistent by so doing. Truth wants not the arts of polemics. She is all simple and sincere, and appears to most advantage in her own native dress.

Making the above allowances for Dr. Clarke's book,[7] it is a very able, learned, and valuable work, and may be read with considerable advantage. But no man should enter upon the perusal of it with a view to learn his creed from thence, till he is competently well acquainted both with the scriptures and Christian antiquity.

Dr.

[7] See the learned Welchman's Examination of Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine, where several of the above charges are brought forward with effect.

Dr. Priestley is sensible of what weight and importance the writings of the Fathers are, in the enquiry concerning the person of Christ, and, therefore, he labours to wrest their authority out of the hands of the Orthodox, who have so long been in pretty peaceable possession of it. If he can carry his point, he is surely very much in the right so to do. And, indeed, I do not see why he should not succeed in the business; for his mode of proceeding will carry all before it. He pretends he has got the scriptures to speak for him from beginning to end. If he can twist and wiredraw them to his own wishes, one may venture to promise him, the Fathers will not be less pliable. It is, however, an aukward circumstance for him, that when a passage, now and then, stands in his way, stares him in the face, and cries aloud, "Christ pre-existed—was begotten "of the Holy Ghost—and was the Creator of the "universe;"—it is an aukward circumstance, I say, that he is obliged to reject some of those passages as spurious and interpolated, others as inconclusive reasonings, and others as improperly applied. This, I think, is enough, if any thing can be enough, to shake the credit of any man's system. All this, however, the learned Doctor has done with the holy scriptures: so that he has the privilege of establishing or rejecting what doctrines soever he thinks good, without being controuled either by Christ or his Apostles.[s] And having carried the point so completely with respect to the bible, he finds an easy conquest over the Fathers. The seven knotty epistles of St. Ignatius, of which the Orthodox have so long made their boast, the Doctor has found out, by his wonderful dexterity in polemical

[s] Well might his friend Mr. Lindsey say that "Dr. Priestley is "equal to a host of adversaries." Vindiciæ Priest. pref. p. 4. None of his adversaries, that I have seen, can write per fas atque nefas, as the Doctor can do. See Strictures on Religious Opinions, passim, where ample evidence of the learned Doctor's polemic skill is produced.

mical enquiries, are *confessedly* spurious, and now *generally* given up by the Learned. And if the pious bishop and martyr, St. Irenæus, happen to drop any thing pointed against the Doctor's progenitors, the ancient Ebionites, of heretical memory, he gently passes it over as though no such passages occurred in that learned and venerable Father's writings. I must, however, do Dr. Priestley the justice to say, that several of his polemical adversaries have misrepresented his design in having recourse to the writings of the Fathers, even after he has repeatedly justified himself on that head. This, I think, has been the case both with Mr. Burn,[9] Mr. Barnard, Mr. Hawker, and even with the last Bampton Lecturer, the Rev. Mr. Kett, in his very valuable and well written discourses.

The account, however, which Dr. Priestley, more than once, has given for drawing the attention of the public to the writings of Christian antiquity, appears to me perfectly satisfactory, and is expressed with elegance and simplicity: "If I may be indulged in a "little allegory," says the Doctor, "thinking myself "in full possession of this *strong hold* of my faith[1] "(the holy scriptures) I thought I could seize also "upon a certain *out-work* of some importance (the "writings of the Fathers) in which the enemy had "thought himself securely lodged. Accordingly I "made a sally, and dislodged him.[2] Attempts have "been

[9] See Letters to Dr. Priestley, p. 5, 6; Kett's Bampton Lectures, ser. 6. p. 195; and Hawker's Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, p. 16, 17.

[1] Never man was more mistaken than the Doctor is in so thinking!

[2] Here again he is full as much mistaken. Socinianism is equally abhorrent to the Scriptures and the Fathers, upon any principles of fair and candid interpretation. And for the truth of this I appeal to the judgment of every reader into whose hands these papers shall fall. If, indeed, the Doctor is determined to *call evil good and good evil*; *to put darkness for light and light for darkness*; *to put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter*; there is no remedy; he must take his own way and follow his own devices. It is the duty, how-

" been made to dispossess me of it, but hitherto they " have been ineffectual. I am now strengthening the " fortifications belonging to it; and, here I am deter- " mined to stand a close and regular siege.—If I am " compelled to surrender, I hope to acquit myself in " such a manner, as to be entitled to leave it with all " the honours of war. Still, however, I shall have my " *strong-hold* to retire into." [3]

I am, however, so far from thinking Dr. Priestley in any respect to blame for having recourse to the writings of the primitive Fathers, to enable him to determine what are the genuine doctrines of Christianity, that I think, after diligently consulting the word of God itself, he took the best possible human means for ascertaining with certainty and precision what those doctrines are. I will, therefore, proceed through their writings in the same chronological manner that we have done in our investigation of the books of the Old and New Testament, as near as may be, till we come towards the close of the fourth century. The doctrines which prevailed in those first and purest ages will bid fair to be the genuine doctrines of Christianity, and more or better cannot be done to establish primitive and evangelical truth.

ever, of every one who has it in his power to warn his fellow creatures against the danger of his sophistical reasonings, and most of all against his false, but most confident, assertions. If Dr. Priestley is right, the whole Christian world, especially the more serious and religious part of it, has been fundamentally wrong, except the heretic Ebion and a few followers, for the last seventeen hundred years. Affecting consideration! Believe it who can!

[3] See Letters to Mr. Burn, p. 7, and Remarks on Primitive Candour, p. 97.

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION II.

The opinions of the APOSTOLICAL FATHERS concerning the PERSON of CHRIST, and the doctrine of the TRINITY.

1. BARNABAS.[4] Whether the Epistle[5] which goes by his name be genuine or not, there is no doubt it is extremely ancient, and goes back as far nearly as the apostolic times. He himself, if he were the author of it, was one of the seventy disciples. Be this, however, as it may, he bears clear testimony to the pre-existence and divinity of our Lord:—"The Lord," says he, "submitted to suffer for our souls, although he be "the Lord of the whole earth, unto whom God said, "the day before the world was finished, *Let* US *make* "*man after* OUR *image and* OUR *likeness.*[6]

2. "For if he had not come in the flesh, how "could we mortals, seeing him, have been preserved; "when they who behold the sun, which is to perish, "and is *the work of* HIS *hands*, are unable to look di- "rectly against its rays?"[7]

3. "Thus the scripture saith concerning us, where "it introduceth the FATHER *speaking to* the SON; "*Let* US *make man after* OUR *likeness and similitude; "and let them have dominion over the beasts of the earth,*

"*and*

[4] For the authority of the Epistle of Barnabas, see Bishop Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith, chap. 2. sect. 2, and Primitive and Apostolical Tradition, chap. 1. sect. 3.—See also Archbishop Wake's Apostolical Fathers. See moreover Dr. Clarke's Reflections on Amyntor, where he says, "The Epistle of Barnabas is "also without controversy ancient, a work of the apostolic age, "being quoted by almost all the primitive Fathers."

[5] Dr. Priestley himself quotes it among the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, Corruptions of Christianity, vol. 1. p. 218.

[6] Section 5.——[7] Ibid.

" *and over the fowls of the air, and over the fish of the* " *sea.* And when the Lord saw the man which he " had formed, that, *behold, he was very good*, he said, " *Encrease, and multiply, and replenish the earth.* And " this *he spake to his* SON." [8]

4. " If then the *Son* of God, being *Lord*, and being " to judge the quick and dead, suffered, to the end that " his wound might make us alive; let us believe, that " the SON of God *had no power to suffer*, had it not " been upon our account." [9]

5. " Mean while thou hast (the whole doctrine) con- " cerning the majesty of Christ; how *all things were* " *made* FOR *him and* THROUGH *him*; to whom be *ho-* " *nour, power*, and *glory, now* and *forever*." [1]

It is evident from these passages, that we have, at least, one instance of a Christian, converted from among the Jews, in the Apostolic age, who believed in the pre-existence and divinity of our blessed Saviour. [2]

6. HERMAS is supposed to be the same whom St. Paul mentions in his Epistle to the Romans. We have one work of his, entitled, The Shepherd; [3] in which also is asserted the pre-existence and divinity of the Son of God:—" The Son of God," says he, " is indeed *more ancient than any creature*; insomuch " that he was *in council with his Father at the creation* " *of all things*." [4]

7. " The *name* of the *Son* of *God* is *great* and *with-* " *out bounds*, and the *whole world is supported by* " *it*." [5]

8. CLEMENS ROMANUS was a convert and disci-

[8] Section 6.——[9] Sect. 7.——[1] Sect. 12.

[2] See Bishop Horsley's Tracts, page 163—169.

[3] For the authority of this work—see Archbishop Wake's Apostolical Fathers;—Bishop Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith, chap. 2. sect. 3;—and Dr. Clarke's Reflections on Amyntor, where he says:—" The Pastor of Hermas is incontestably a most ancient " work, being cited by almost all the primitive Fathers extant, that " lived in or near the second century."

[4] Sim. 9. sect. 12.——[5] Sim. 9. sect. 14.

ple of the Apostles.[6] He died a martyr, A. D. 100. One complete epistle, and part of another, are still extant, of his writing;[7] from whence it evidently appears he was an advocate for the same doctrines as all those who had gone before him:—"The sceptre of "the majesty of God," says he, "our Lord Jesus "Christ, came not in the shew of pride and arro- "gance, *though he had it in his power*; but in humility, "as the Holy Spirit spake before concerning him."[8] Is not this an allusion to that celebrated place of St. Paul, where he says, that our Lord Jesus Christ, *being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God*? And doth not this shew, that, according to St. Clement, our blessed Saviour was in being before he chose the form in which he appeared in the world?[9]

9. "The Corinthians, being content with the por- "tion GOD had dispensed to them, and for hearkening "diligently unto his word, being enlarged in their "bowels, having HIS *sufferings* always before their "eyes."[1]

10. "Have we not all *one* GOD, and *one* CHRIST? "Is not *one* SPIRIT of grace poured upon us all?[2]

11. "GOD liveth, and the LORD JESUS CHRIST, "and the HOLY SPIRIT."[3]

12. "All these has the great Creator and Lord of "all commanded to observe peace and concord; be- "ing good to all: but especially to us who flee to his "mercy *through our Lord Jesus Christ*; TO WHOM be "*glory* and *majesty* forever and ever. Amen."[4]

13. "*Blessed*

[6] Phil. 4. 3.

[7] For the authority of St. Clement's Epistles, see Archbishop Wake's Apostolical Fathers; Bishop Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith, cap. 3. sect. 1; and Dr. Clarke's Reflections on Amyntor. See also Eusebius's Eccl. History, l. 3. cap. 38. The second is supposed to be spurious.

[8] 1 Epist. sect. 16.

[9] See this passage of St. Paul vindicated from the erroneous interpretation of Dr. Priestley in Burgh's Sequel, p. 9—13.

[1] 1 Ep. sect. 2.——[2] Ibid. sect. 46.——[3] Basil, vol. 2. p. 358.

[4] 1 Ep. sect. 20.

13. "*Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven.* "Now this blessing is fulfilled in those, who are chosen "by God, *through Jesus Christ our Lord*, TO WHOM be "*glory* forever and ever. Amen."[5]

These two doxologies are somewhat ambiguous, but seem rather to be applied to the Redeemer of mankind.

14. "From him (Abraham) came our Lord Jesus "Christ, according to the flesh." Is not this a plain allusion to St. Paul's distinction, Rom. 9. 5?[6]

15. "Let us *pray to our Lord Jesus Christ*, whose "blood was given for us."[7]

16. "We ought to think of *Jesus Christ as* GOD; "as of the Judge of the quick and the dead."[8]

17. "Wherein must we confess Christ? In doing "those things which he saith, and not disobeying his "commandments: by WORSHIPPING *him*, not with our "lips only, but with *all our heart, and with all our* "*mind*."[9]

18. "Our one Lord Jesus Christ, who has saved "us, being FIRST *a spirit, was made flesh*, and so called "us."[1]

19. Besides all these passages descriptive of the sentiments of St. Clement, respecting the person of our blessed Saviour, it is evident from several other internal marks, that he ranked not with any of the Unitarians of the day in which he lived. It is plain he was no Ebionite, because he quotes St. Paul's Epistles, which they rejected. He was no Nazarene, because he quotes the gospels (all but St. John's, which was not then written) according to our copies, which the Nazarenes did not do. Nor was he a Cerinthian, because he quotes the writings of the Old Testament with approbation, which these Heretics rejected.

20. IGNATIUS was a disciple of St. John, was appointed

[5] Ibid. sect. 50.——[6] Ibid. sect. 32.——[7] Ibid. sect. 21.
[8] 2 Ep. sect. 1.——[9] Ibid. sect. 2.——[1] Ibid. sect. 9.

pointed bishop of Antioch by St. Paul, was approved of by St. Peter, and had the honour of dying a martyr in the year of our Lord 107. He is, moreover, said to have been the child whom our Saviour took up in his arms, and pointed out as an example of innocency. Whether this is true or not, it shews the opinion the ancients had of his piety. Seven of his genuine epistles are still extant, and the doctrines they contain are generally considered as perfectly orthodox.[2] I will produce

[2] Dr. Priestley seems to allow, that these Epistles, according to our present copies of them, do contain the doctrine of Christ's divinity. But then he is at no loss to get over this difficulty; for if he cannot answer them, he can deny their authenticity, and thus do the business at one stroke. So when he cannot easily confute the doctrine of Christ's conception by the Holy Ghost, he strikes out with one turn of his pen all those chapters from the gospels which contain the narrative: and when the arguments of St. Paul prove too hard for the learned Doctor, he begins to degrade the character of the Apostle, and vainly pretends he has proved he reasons inconclusively. So here, when the Epistles of this holy Father and Martyr stand in the way of the Doctor's scheme, he makes no more to do, but boldly denies their authority. I will transcribe the whole passage from his Letters to Dr. Horsley, as it is a very curious one, and deserves the severest animadversion: "Besides Clemens Romanus, you refer to the Epistles of Ignatius, for a proof of the early knowledge of the doctrine of Christ's divinity. The holy Father, you say, p. 19, hardly ever mentions Christ without introducing some explicit assertions of his divinity, or without joining with the name of Christ some epithet in which it is implied. All this is very true, according to our present copies of Ignatius's epistles. But you must know that the genuineness of them is not only very much doubted, but *generally* given up by the learned; and it was not perfectly ingenuous in you to conceal that circumstance."

If Dr. Priestley's ipse dixit may pass for argument and truth, the seven epistles of Ignatius are *generally* given up by the learned. But—is it so? Is this the fact? By no means. Dr. Priestley may give them up, because they subvert that system of doctrine, which he is determined to support at all hazards: and a few others may join him in crying them down, because they maintain the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons: but that they are *generally* given up by the learned is a notorious untruth. For it is well known, that a large majority of the learned in ecclesiastical antiquity consider the epistles in question as the genuine work of the pious bishop and martyr to whom they are ascribed: nor is there any good

produce such passages from them as seem, directly or indirectly, to our present purpose:—

"According to the will of the Father, and Jesus "Christ our GOD."[3]

21. "There is one physician both fleshly and spi- "ritual; made and not made; GOD INCARNATE; true "life in death; both of Mary and of God: first pas- "sible, then impassible; *even* Jesus Christ our Lord."[4]

22. "*Nothing is concealed* from the *Lord*, but even "our secrets are nigh unto him."[5]

23. "Our

reason to think that they have suffered more by the hand of time or interpolation than other writings of the same antiquity. Let this be, however, as it may, these seven celebrated epistles are considered as genuine, for any thing that appears to the contrary, by all the learned Fathers of the church for the first 4 or 5 centuries; by those very Fathers from whom we receive the holy scriptures themselves as the word of God. And of those learned men, who have lived since the Reformation, they have been considered as genuine by some of the most celebrated in this department of literature. In this number are to be ranked the names of Fabricius—I. Vossius—Usher—Hammond—Brucker—Huetius—Ittigius—Petavius—Grotius—Pearson—Bull—Cave—Wake—Cotelerius—Grabe—Dupin—Fleury—Tillemont—Bochart—Le Clerc—Nelson—Reeves—Leslie—Hickes—Marshal—Beveridge—Chillingworth—Waterland—Zanchius—Buddæus—Bishop—Berriman—Clarke—Mosheim—Lardner—Jortin:—and, indeed, the great body of the learned in every age have been fully of opinion, that these epistles are the genuine work of the author to whom they are ascribed. With what face then can Dr. Priestley say they are *generally* given up by the learned?—The case is plain.—It does not suit the Doctor's hypothesis to admit them.—But then—where is truth, fidelity, and honour?—It is by arts like these Voltaire explodes even the bible itself.

For the authenticity of these epistles of Ignatius—see Bishop Horsley's Tracts, p. 120—Archbishop Wake's Apostolical Fathers—Dr. Clarke's Reflections on Amyntor—and Bishop Pearson's Vindiciæ. See also Bishop Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith, chap. 2. sect. 6.—Likewise Eusebius's Eccl. Hist. book 3. chap. 36.—Consult also the Notes to Kett's Sermons, p. 21—24.

"Dr. Priestley is certainly in the right to reprobate these "Epistles if he can," says an unknown author; "they subvert all "his theology and history."

Bishop Horsley's Tracts, p. 300.

[3] Ep. ad Ep. introd.

[4] Ibid. sect. 7.——[5] Ibid. sect. 15.

23. " Our God, Jesus Christ, was, according to the " dispensation of God, conceived in the womb of " Mary, of the seed of David, by the Holy Ghost." [6]

24. " Now the virginity of Mary, and He who was " born of her, was kept in secret from the prince of " this world; as was also the death of our Lord: three " of the mysteries the most spoken of throughout the " world, yet done in secret by God." [7]

25. " Ignorance was taken away, the old kingdom " abolished, God *appearing in the form of man*, and man " acting as God." [8]

26. " Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David " according to the flesh, the son of man, and *Son of* " *God*." [9]

27. In archbishop Usher's edition of this Epistle we have the following passage:—" But we have also a " physician, the Lord our God, Jesus the Christ, be- " fore ages the only-begotten Son and Word, but af- " terwards man also of the virgin Mary; *for the Word* " *was made flesh*; incorporeal in a body; exempt from " sufferings in a suffering body; immortal in a mortal " body, life in corruption." This passage is similar to one of those which we have already quoted from this same epistle, yet it is only just to observe, that it is omitted as spurious by other editors.

28. " Our God, Jesus Christ, being in the Father, " doth so much the more appear." [1]

29. " *Pray* unto *Christ* for me." [2]

30. " Permit me to imitate the passion of Christ, " my God." [3]

31. " Ignatius—to the church of *God the Father*, " and *our Lord Jesus Christ*—by the *Holy Ghost*." [4]

32. " I exhort you, that ye study to do all things in " divine concord; your bishop presiding in the place " of God; your presbyters in the place of the coun- " cil

[6] Ibid. sect. 18.——[7] Ibid. sect. 19.——[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid. sect. 20.——[1] Ep. ad Rom. sect. 3.——[2] Ibid. sect. 4.
[3] Ibid. sect. 6.——[4] Ep. ad Mag. Introd.

" cil of the Apostles; and your deacons most dear " to me, being entrusted with the ministry of Jesus " Christ; *who was with the* FATHER *before all ages,* " *and appeared in the end to us.*" [5]

33. " There is one God, who has manifested him- " self by Jesus Christ his Son, who is *his eternal Word,* " not coming forth from silence, who in all things " pleased him that sent him." [6]

34. " Study to be confirmed in the doctrine of our " Lord, and of his Apostles; that so, whatsoever ye do, " ye may prosper both in body and spirit; in faith and " charity; *in the Son,* and in *the Father,* and in *the* " *Holy Spirit.*" [7]

35. " Be subject to your bishop, and to one another, " as Jesus Christ to the Father, according to the flesh; " and the Apostles both to *Christ,* and to the *Father,* " and to the *Holy Ghost.*" [8]

36. " Consider the times; and expect him, who is " above all time, *eternal, invisible,* though *for our sakes* " *made visible; impalpable,* and *impassible,* yet for us " *subjected to sufferings;* enduring all manner of ways " for our salvation." [9]

37. " I wish you all happiness in our *God,* Jesus " Christ." [1]

38. I *glorify Jesus Christ, the God* who hath thus filled you with wisdom. [2]

39. All these things (Jesus Christ) suffered for us that we might be saved, and he did truly suffer, as also *he did truly raise up himself.* [3]

40. After his resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as he was flesh; *although as to his spirit he was united to the Father.* [4]

41. Ignatius was martyred, A. D. 107. There is a conversation recorded which passed between him and

[5] Epistle to the Magnesians, Sect. 6.——[6] Do. Sect. 8.
[7] Do. Sect. 13.——[8] Do. do.
[9] Epistle to Polycarp, sect. 3.——[1] Ibid. sect. 8.
[2] Epist. ad Smyr. sect. 1.——[3] Ibid. sect. 2.——[4] Ibid. sect. 3.

Trajan, which is strongly expressive of his belief of our Saviour's divinity. Among other questions which the Emperor put to this venerable Bishop, one was, "Whether he carried Christ within him?" He replied, "I do; for it is written, *I will dwell in them and walk* "*in them.*" See 2 Cor. 6. 16, and Levit. 26. 12. The Emperor then ordered that he should be carried to Rome, and there be devoured by wild beasts. Upon hearing this sentence the venerable man cried out with joy, "I thank thee, O Lord, that thou hast vouchsafed "to honour me with a perfect love towards thee, and "hast made me to be put in iron bonds with thine "apostle Paul."

42. The Relation of his martyrdom farther tells us, that immediately before he was delivered to the beasts, "all the brethren at Rome kneeling down with him, "*he prayed to the Son of God* in behalf of the churches."

43. This same pious Relation concludes with an address to the Holy Trinity:—"Christ Jesus our Lord; "*by whom, and with whom*, all glory and power, be to "the *Father*, with the *blessed Spirit*, forever and ever. "Amen."

44. Polycarp[s] was a disciple of St. John, and by him made bishop of Smyrna, A. D. 82. He was burnt alive in the 100th. year of his age, and in the year of our Lord 166. His genuine writings are only one Epistle to the Philippians. In this, however, he is not silent concerning the dignity of his blessed Master:—

"Wherefore,"

[s] Irenæus assures us, that "Polycarp always taught those things "which he had learned from the Apostles, and which he delivered "to the church, and which alone are true. All the churches "throughout Asia bear witness to this, as do the Successors of "Polycarp, in his seat, to this day; who was a far more worthy, "faithful, steady witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion, "and other false teachers."——

I should observe here that there is some little difference of opinion among the Learned concerning the precise year in which both Ignatius and Polycarp were put to death; but this circumstance makes no difference with respect to the subject now under consideration.

" Wherefore," says this good man, " girding up the " loins of your mind, serve the Lord with fear, and in " truth; laying aside all empty and vain speech, and " the error of many; believing in him that raised up " our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and hath given " him glory and a throne at his right hand; to whom " all things are made subject, both that are in heaven, " and that are in earth; *whom every living creature shall* " *worship*; who shall come to be the judge of quick " and dead."*

45. " Now the God and Father of our Lord Jesus " Christ; and he himself, who is our everlasting high- " priest, the *Son of God, even Jesus Christ, build you up* " *in faith and in truth.*" *

46. There is an excellent fragment of Polycarp, preserved by Victor Capuanus, and cited by Feuardentius, in his notes on the third book of Irenæus, where he gives a good account of the design each of the Evangelists had in writing his gospel; in the course of which he advances some things extremely favourable to our present enquiry:—" Matthew," says this holy Martyr, " writing to the Hebrews, has inserted the gene- " alogy of Christ, that he might shew Christ to be " descended of that race, from whence all the prophets " had foretold he was to be born. But John, who was " fixed at Ephesus, where the law was not known by " the Gentiles, began his gospel with the cause of our " redemption; which cause was manifest from this, " that God willed his Son to be incarnate for our sal- " vation. But Luke begins with the priesthood of " Zacharias, that, by the miracle of his Son's nativity, " and the office of so great a preacher, he might make " known the divinity of Christ. And Mark, there- " fore, sets forth some ancient passages of prophetic " mystery, agreeing to the coming of Christ, that his

* Epist. ad Philip. sect. 2.
* Ibid, sect. 12.

" preaching might not seem a novelty, but be conform-
" able to what had been anciently delivered." [7]

47. In the circular Epistle of the church of Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of this holy man, we have the following testimonies to the truths now under consideration:—" Eighty and six years have I now *served*
" *Christ*, and he has never done me the least wrong:
" how then can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?" [8]

48. When he was at the stake he made a prayer to almighty God, which he finished in these words: " For
" this, and for all things else, I praise thee, I bless
" thee, I glorify thee, by the eternal and heavenly High
" Priest, Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son; *with whom*
" to *thee* and the *Holy Ghost*, be glory both now, and
" to all succeeding ages. Amen." [9]

49. " The Governour hindered the Christians from
" having the body of the Martyr, lest," says he,
" *forsaking him that was crucified, they should begin to*
" *worship this Polycarp.* And this was said at the sug-
" gestion and instance of the Jews, who also watched
" us," say the authors of this relation, " that we
" should not take him out of the fire: not consider-
" ing," say they, " that neither is it possible for us
" *ever to forsake Christ, nor worship any other besides*
" *him.* For *him*, indeed, as being *the Son of God, we*
" *do adore:* but for the Martyrs, we worthily love
" them, as the disciples and followers of our Lord,
" and upon the account of their exceeding great affec-
" tion towards their Master and their King." [1]

50. " God who is able to bring all of us by his
" grace and help to his eternal kingdom, *through his*
" *only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; to whom be glory,*
" *and honour, and power, and majesty, forever and ever.*
" Amen." [2]

51. " But *our Saviour Christ reigning forevermore:*
" *to*

[7] Lib. 3. c. 3.——[8] Martyrdom of Polycarp, sect. 9.
[9] Do. sect. 14.——[1] Do. sect. 17.——[2] Ibid. sect. 20.

" *to him be honour, glory, majesty, and an eternal throne,*
" *from generation to generation.* Amen." [3]

52. " *Jesus Christ; with whom, glory be to God the*
" *Father, and the Holy Spirit,* for the salvation of his
" chosen saints." [4]

53. " That Jesus Christ our Lord may also gather
" me together with his elect: *to whom with the Fa-*
" *ther, and the Holy Ghost, be glory forever and ever.*
" Amen." [5]

These seven witnesses all lived in the first century, which is usually called the Apostolic age. The five first, namely, Barnabas, Hermas, Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, most of whom sealed the truth with their blood, had every possible opportunity of being acquainted with the great truths of the gospel. The believers, who wrote the two relations concerning the martyrdoms of Ignatius and Polycarp, seem likewise to have been so favourably circumstanced that they could not be ignorant of the doctrines and practices of the first age. All these opinions, therefore, delivered by these seven witnesses, will bid fair for being the true ones, and conformable to those of the Apostles, by whom they had been instructed, and from whom they had received them.

Such is the evidence which arises to the Divinity of our blessed Saviour from the immediate successors of the Apostles. [6]

PART

[3] Ibid. sect. 21.——[4] Ibid. sect. 22.

[5] Ibid. Advert. to the Relation.—This doxology probably belongs to the latter end of the second, or beginning of the third century: but, as it is annexed to this Relation, I have introduced it here.

[6] The celebrated Brucker says, when speaking of these Apostolical fathers, " The object of their most praise-worthy endeavours
" was, to follow the example of their masters, and to exhibit the
" truths of the gospel in such plainness of instruction, that even
" the weak and children might be led to a knowledge of them;
" thinking that they had then sufficiently discharged the office of
" teacher, when without the artificial aids of human erudition, or
" any mixture of philosophical conceits, they had boldly and openly,

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION III.

The opinions of the CHRISTIAN FATHERS, who lived in the first part of the second century, concerning the PERSON of CHRIST, and the doctrine of the TRINITY.

WE will now pass on to those Authors who lived in the second age.'

54. QUADRATUS was bishop of Athens. He presented an Apology to the emperor Adrian about the year of our Lord 125. The Apology itself is lost: but Eusebius declares it was in the hands of many of the brethren

" in their speeches and writings, held forth to the consideration of " all men, even the most illiterate, the Author of all salvation, " and the means by which the possession of it was to be secured. " Of this we have a singular and shining instance in the genuine " epistles now extant of Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and Polycarp, " who were disciples of the Apostles, and who, combining the " simplicity of evangelic doctrine, with the sublimity of divine " truth, have displayed them in a stile worthy of men distinguished " by the name of Apostolic." Hist. Crit. Phil. v. 3. p. 270.

Dr. Jortin writes, " If the opinion of Christ's divinity had not " prevailed commonly among the Christians of the first and second " centuries, how came it to pass, that Adrian is said to have design- " ed to deify Jesus Christ, or that Severus Alexander intended it?" Remarks on Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 90.

" I allow," says Dr. Priestley himself, " all that Bishop Bull " and Mr. Burgh ascribe to the Fathers of the second and third " century; I allow that they held the doctrine of the divinity of " the Son, at least; but it was in a qualified sense, and by no means " the same that was maintained after the council of Nice." Defence of Unit. for 1787, p. 139.

Whether the Fathers of the first century also held not the doctrine of Christ's divinity, the Reader will judge from the quotations we have just produced out of their writings: and whether the Fathers of the second and third ages maintained it in any other sense than was received at and after the council of Nice, the following extracts from their works, and the works of other Authors who have spoken or written upon the subject, will plainly shew.

brethren in his time; that he himself was possessed of it; and that it contained clear evidences of the author's understanding, and of his truly apostolical faith and sound doctrine.[8] St. Jerome also calls the Apology of this pious bishop a very useful book, and says it was full of reason and faith, and becoming the apostolical doctrine.[9]

55. ARISTIDES was a philosopher of Athens, and became a convert to Christianity in the beginning of the second century. He was a very eloquent man, and presented an Apology to the emperor Adrian in favour of the Christians about the same time with Quadratus. Eusebius says he was a faithful man.[1] And St. Jerome observes, that he was an eloquent philosopher, and a disciple of Christ.[2] Petavius relates also, that it was reported of him in the Martyrologies, how he very clearly and fully discoursed in the presence of the Emperor, that Jesus Christ was GOD.[3]

56. EUSEBIUS informs us, that there were in all fifteen bishops, who presided over the church at Jerusalem, from the times of the Apostles till the siege of that city under Adrian, about the year of our Lord 136. All these bishops were Hebrews by birth, had sincerely embraced the faith of Christ, and were thought worthy of the episcopal office, by those who were competent to judge.[4] And as all the other bishops in the Christian world were in communion with those of Jerusalem, it will follow, that they also were looked upon as orthodox in the faith: for it is well known by those who are at all acquainted with the history of those times, that whenever any of the bishops declined from what was deemed the path of truth on any of the great leading doctrines of Christianity; of which the divinity of Christ

[8] Eus. Ec. Hist. book 4. ch. 3.
[9] Cat. Ec. Script. in Quadrato.
[1] Eus. Ec. Hist. b. 4. ch. 3.
[2] Cat. Ec. Script. in Quadrato.
[3] Impres. ad Tom. 2. Dogm. Theolog.
[4] Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 5.

Christ was always esteemed one, they were constantly excluded from communion by all the rest of the orthodox believers. Eusebius, therefore, speaking with so much approbation of these first fifteen bishops of Jerusalem, renders it extremely probable, that they were all considered at that time as maintaining the commonly received principles of Christianity. [5]

57. MILTIADES was a man of considerable note towards the middle of this second age, and is spoken of by Eusebius as a defender of the doctrines which we usually call orthodox. [6]

58. HEGESIPPUS, [7] the ecclesiastical historian, lived before,

[5] See Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 17. Mosheim tells us that the term Nazarene was originally given to all Christians, and that it was afterwards appropriated to those Christians of Jerusalem, who considered the observance of the Mosaical rites as necessary to salvation. These were distinct from the Ebionites, and not placed by the ancient Christians in the heretical register, while the latter were considered as a sect, whose tenets were destructive of the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. But, after the second destruction of Jerusalem by Adrian, they deserted the ordinary assemblies of Christians, and were then reckoned to be a distinct sect, but yet were treated by other Christians with great gentleness, as agreeing in the main doctrines of Christianity.

Eusebius tells us expressly, that the Ebionites believed Christ to be only a common man, born of Joseph and Mary. But there were others called by the same name that observed the ceremonies of the Mosaical law, and yet, avoiding their absurd notions, believed the pre-existence of Christ, and that he was God, the Word and Wisdom of the Father.

Sulpitius Severus a good historian of the fourth century attests the same thing. He tells us that the emperor Adrian placed a guard to keep the Jews out of Jerusalem, which was of service to the Christian faith: for they almost all, together with the observance of the law, believed Christ to be God.*

St. Augustin also testifies the same thing. He distinguishes the Nazarenes from the Cerinthians and Ebionites, and tells us the latter held that Christ was only a man: but the former, though they observed the precepts of the law, yet confessed that Christ was the Son of God.†

[6] Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 28.

[7] See a defence of Hegesippus's orthodoxy in Bishop Horsley's Tracts, p. 169.

* Sac. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 45.----† Lib. de Hæres. c. 8, 9, 10.

before, or near the time of Justin Martyr. He came to Rome about the year 157, while Anicetus was bishop there, and continued in that capital till the year 185, in friendship and communion with the said Anicetus, with Soter and Eleutherus, his two successors in office. Now it is certain, that these three Roman bishops were orthodox respecting the divinity of Christ, because they were held in high esteem with Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, who, we know, believed that doctrine, and considered all those who rejected it in the light of heretics. It will follow, therefore, from these premises, according to the spirit and practice of those times, that Hegesippus must have been sound in the faith.

Here then are *five* other witnesses, or, to speak more exactly, here are four eminent individuals, and a series of fifteen bishops in the most ancient church in the world, who all seem to have been orthodox in the faith, on the great doctrines now in question, and who all lived before the time that Justin Martyr came forward as a defender of the Christian faith. These, together with the seven former, who preceded them, make the number of witnesses in favour of orthodoxy in the prime of antiquity exactly twelve: witnesses sufficiently numerous and circumstantial to determine what were then deemed the genuine doctrines of Christianity.

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION IV.

The opinion of JUSTIN MARTYR concerning the PERSON of CHRIST, with a vindication of him from the charge of innovation.

WE are now come to the time of Justin Martyr. It is necessary we should pause a little, and attempt to vindicate his character from the aspersions of the Socinians. For Dr. Priestley asserts, that the doctrines of the Trinity and divinity of Christ were never known and received in the Christian church till introduced by him from the Platonic school.[8] On the contrary I affirm, with all possible confidence, that the pre-existence and divinity of Christ were clearly preached by our Saviour himself—by St. Peter—St. Paul—and St. John.[9] Nay, what is more, I solemnly affirm, that Philo, the learned Jew, who lived in the time of our Saviour and his Apostles, was a believer in both these doctrines.[1]

Moreover, most of the foregoing testimonies, to the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, extracted from the writings of the Ancients, whether Christians or Heathens, are prior to the time of Justin Martyr. The reader then will judge what dependance can be placed on the declarations of Dr. Priestley as a writer upon these great subjects. His History of Corruptions abounds with such unfounded assertions. With the utmost

[8] "We find nothing like divinity ascribed to Christ before Justin "Martyr." History of Corruptions vol. 1. p. 32.

[9] It is not necessary to repeat here the proofs of this assertion. Let the Reader consult the whole of the second part of this Apology.

[1] See Part. 5. sect. 2.

utmost confidence we appeal to all antiquity, whether Jewish, Heathen, or Christian, for the truth of the doctrines we espouse. All antiquity avows the fact, that such doctrines were taught. And these facts are so plain, clear, and stubborn, that all the sophistry of the most dexterous Polemics cannot overturn them. It cannot be. The doctrine of Christ's divinity rests upon the most undoubted historical evidence. The bible is full of it. Christian, Heathen, and Jewish antiquity is full of it. And, in my opinion, the Deists themselves act a more consistent part, in rejecting the whole bible as a fable, than the Socinians do, who pretend to embrace revelation, and yet cashier some of its most important and distinguishing doctrines. How much more according to truth than Dr. Priestley's, is the declaration of Julian the Apostate, who acknowledges that St. John did teach that Jesus Christ was God:—" Therefore" says he, " neither Paul, nor " Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark, attempted to say, " that Jesus was God, but the good natured John, " who perceived that now (at the time of writing his " gospel) a great multitude, in many of the Grecian " and Italian cities, were carried away with this disease. " —He first dared to speak it." [2] —What this learned Emperor says of Paul, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is not strictly true. For though the three Evangelists in question do not so fully teach the doctrine of Christ's divinity as St. John; yet they do teach it in a language sufficiently clear and intelligible to candid Readers. Paul, however, is much fuller upon the subject than any one of the three. And St. John, even in the opinion of this implacable enemy of Christianity, did teach the doctrine. Important concession! For if St. John taught it, surely Justin Martyr was not the inventor of it. We insist upon it, however, that St. Paul, in particular, taught the doctrine in question twenty or thirty years before St. John wrote his gospel,

[2] Julian apud Cyril, l. 10.

pel. But as this subject has already undergone a discussion in the former part of this work, it will not be necessary to return to it again, but only to refer the reader to what has been there advanced. Several other arguments, indeed, present themselves to our consideration, which have not yet been attended to, whereby it is demonstrably proved, that the divinity of our blessed Saviour had been generally received among Christians, long before Justin Martyr wrote his Apology, or the Dialogue with Trypho, the learned Jew. Some of these arguments I will now submit to the consideration of the candid reader, and appeal to his judgment for the validity of them. If one or more of them shall fail, perhaps another of them may recommend itself as being entirely satisfactory. To me they are all of some weight. And if any *one* of them is conclusive the point in debate is gained.

1. Justin Martyr presented his first Apology to the emperor Antoninus Pius about the year of our Lord 140. The internal marks of its being agreeable to the principles then commonly received among Christians are incontestible. He lays before the Emperor the doctrines of Christianity without disguise, and appeals to him for the propriety of them. He expressly says they believed the Trinity and the incarnation of the Son of God. And all this he does, without giving the least intimation, that his sentiments upon these subjects were novel, and peculiar to himself. He evidently, all the way through, defends them as the common and well known principles of believers.—Moreover, he lived in the metropolis of the Roman empire during the time the bishops Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus presided over the church there; the first and last of whom suffered martyrdom in defence of the truth. He was in communion with each of these bishops in their course, drew his pen more than once in defence of their righteous cause, and stopped the torrent of persecution which raged against

against them. Nay, what is more, during his abode at Rome he lived in communion with the venerable Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and bishop of Smyrna, who came thither about the year 158, to consult with Anicetus concerning the time of celebrating Easter. He was also in communion with Hegesippus, who came to Rome nearly at the same period, and continued there till the day of his death. Whether they were intimately acquainted or not, history does not say, though it is exceedingly probable they were, as they are known to have been countrymen, and both in communion with the same bishop.

2. Another argument, arising from internal evidence, may be this: Justin, in the Dialogue between himself and Trypho the Jew, proposeth two questions: The first is, Whether Jesus Christ is the promised Messiah? This question he saith he can maintain against Trypho, though he should not acknowledge the Messiah to be any more than a mere man. The second question comprehends more than one head: for it goes to enquire whether the Messiah had a being before his incarnation? Whether he was God? And whether he was born of a Virgin? All these he declares were the true doctrines of the ancient Jewish prophets, and of Jesus Christ himself. He advanceth all these things, as being well known and generally received among Christians. He quotes multitudes of passages out of the Old Testament in favour of these doctrines, and carefully endeavours to confute the different solutions, which the Jewish Rabbins made use of to evade the force of his arguments. This renders it certain that the proofs which were drawn from the books of the Old Testament were by no means new to the Jews, but that they had often been urged by the Christians, and as frequently answered by the Jews. This was particularly the case with that remarkable passage in the first chapter of Genesis, where the Almighty is introduced as saying, *Let us make man in our image.*

The

The Christians long before the time of Justin urged these words as a proof of the Trinity. And even the learned Philo acknowledged, that the expressions implied the taking in of others as fellow workmen. But some of his countrymen gave one interpretation, and some another. Some said, God spake to his Angels. Some, that he spake in the plural because of his majesty. Others, that he spake to the elements. All these inventions of the Jews Justin takes notice of, and rejects them as improper and unnatural. If, therefore, he was the first inventor of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the other doctrines therewith connected, why doth he take notice of and reject with scorn all those silly evasions made use of by the Jewish Rabbins? It appears, then, that the Christians, before his time, did believe the doctrine of the Trinity, because the Jews, during his own age, made so many different answers to the difficulty in question.

3. Another internal argument in proof that Justin was not the inventor of the doctrine of the Trinity, but that it had prevailed among Christians before his time, ariseth from the manner in which he speaks of those among them, who rejected the divinity of our blessed Saviour, and believed him to be born of Joseph and Mary. "There are some among us," says he, "who confess that he is Christ, but affirm him to be "man born of men; with whom I do not agree; nor "could it be said by most of those who are of my "sentiments; for we have been commanded by Christ "himself, not to believe the injunctions of men, but "to believe those things which were preached by the "blessed Prophets, and taught by Christ himself."

From hence it appears, that though there were some in the days of Justin who believed Christ to be a mere man, yet the great body of the Christians, who gave heed to the holy Prophets and our blessed Saviour, were

were of a different opinion, and believed as Justin did concerning him. [3]

4. Another internal argument will arise from the conduct of Justin in his Dialogue with Trypho, where he represents the Christians of his own age as being endowed with the gifts of miracles, and the power of ejecting devils in the name of our blessed Saviour, as of the true God. [4] Now we do not read, that either the Ebionites, or Cerinthians, those ancient heretics, ever had, or ever pretended to be favoured with, this supernatural power. And it is very remarkable, that Irenæus makes this a distinguishing mark between the catholic church and all the assemblies of heretics. [5]

5. Another argument for the divinity of Christ ariseth from the conduct of Trypho the Jew, and adversary of Justin, who frequently objects to the Christians, that they worshipped Jesus Christ as God; while Justin undertakes to justify their conduct in so doing; a sufficient proof that Justin was not the inventor of the doctrine.

6. Another argument of the same kind, arises from this consideration, that neither Trypho the Jew, nor Rabbi Jochanan, objected the novelty of the doctrine of the Trinity, which they undoubtedly would have done, had it been lately invented; but both proceed upon the principle, that the doctrine was commonly received by the Christian church.

7. Another

[3] It is remarkable, that Faustus Socinus is compelled to acknowledge, both in contradiction to himself, Dr. Priestley, and all our other Ebionites, "That from the infancy of the church, there had "been very many pious, learned men, martyrs too, who had em-"braced this grievous error, namely, that Jesus Christ is that one "God, who created all things, or certainly begotten of his proper "substance." Epist. 3d. to Radecius.

This concession is giving up the point. For if there were very many from the infancy of the church, who espoused these doctrines, and some who even died martyrs, how can the Socinians say, that Justin Martyr, who lived about the middle of the second century, was the inventor of them?

[4] Dial. with Tryph. p. 311.——[5] Lib. 4. c. 45.

7. Another argument will arise from the assertion of Irenæus in the second and third sections of the first book of his learned Work. For he saith, that the common faith of the churches, all the world over, was that of the Trinity and the divinity of Jesus Christ. Dr. Priestley says these doctrines were never heard of till Justin wrote in defence of them. Now we know Justin published his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew in defence of these doctrines about the year 140. Irenæus wrote the above declaration about 170; that is, thirty years after Justin's Dialogue was published. It follows, therefore, that Justin must have converted all the world to his own way of thinking, and to an erroneous, blasphemous, and idolatrous way of worship, in the course of thirty years! Credat Judæus Apella! What absurdities will not men, sensible, learned, and worthy men embrace in defence of a system! Alas for poor human nature! Arguments the most weak and inconclusive shall be as cogent as demonstrations; and demonstrations themselves shall appear utterly fallacious. Such is the power of prejudice! I pretend not to be more exempt than my fellow creatures. Let sober men judge between us!

8. Another argument in proof that Justin was not the first broacher of the doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity arises from the history of Rabbi Jochanan. He lived at Babylon, and was the chief of the Jewish synagogue there, while Justin lived and taught in Greece and Rome. Now this Rabbi takes much pains to instruct the Jews in Babylon how to answer the Christians, who proved a plurality of persons in the Divine Nature from the books of the Old Testament. Babylon was at a vast distance from Rome. The Romans were almost always at war with the people of those countries in the period of which we speak. It is not, therefore, in the least probable that Rabbi Jochanan should know any thing of the new and unheard of principles taught by Justin, at such a distance,

and

and under such circumstances. It is more likely, that the very name of Justin had never reached his ears, much less that he was acquainted with his religious principles, and thought it necessary to arm his brethren of the synagogue against them. Be these things as they may, it is certain this celebrated Rabbi undertook to confute the arguments which the Christians brought from those passages in the Old Testament, that seem at least to imply a plurality in the Godhead. He particularly considers the proofs which Christians even then drew from—*Let us make man—Come and let us go down—What nation is so great who hath Gods so nigh—I beheld till the thrones were cast down and the Ancient of days did sit—Beware of him, for my name is in him.* How could he answer arguments which never had any existence? It is evident, therefore, that the Christians in and about Babylon believed the doctrine of a Trinity at that time. And from thence it will follow, with a degree of probability amounting almost to certainty, that Justin Martyr was not the original author of that doctrine.

9. An argument, similar to this of Dr. Priestley, was, even so early as the latter end of the second, or beginning of the third century, urged by the heretics against the doctrines of the Trinity and divinity of Christ: only it happens, unfortunately, that Dr. Priestley contradicts, in some degree, the assertions of his ancient brethren. For he says, these doctrines were unknown in the Christian church till invented by Justin. Now Justin was martyred about the year 163. These ancient heretics say, that the doctrines in question were unknown till the time of Victor, bishop of Rome, who died in the year 201.—But, to pass over the contradictions of these ancient and modern Socinians, let us attend to the answer that was given them at that time by some unknown defender of the divinity of Christ. Some say it was Caius, and others ascribe it to Origen. Who the person was is of no great conse-

quence in the present argument. His words are taken from a discourse he had written against the heresy of Artemo, who, like Dr. Priestley, believed that Jesus Christ was no more than a mere man. That the true apostolical doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ was preserved till Victor's days, but that it was corrupted from that time, "may possibly be somewhat "probable," says this author, "if what they assert "had not, first, been confuted by the holy scriptures; "and, secondly, by the writings of those Christians "who were more ancient than Victor, such as Justin, "Miltiades, Tatian, and Clement, and of many others; "in all whose books the divinity of Christ is maintained. For who can be ignorant of the writings "of Irenæus, Melito, and the rest, who have "taught, that Jesus Christ was God and man at the "same time? The psalms also and hymns of the "brethren, written since the beginning by the faithful, "do set forth the praises of Christ, the Word of "God, ascribing divinity to him.[6] So that since the "doctrine of the church has been preached for so many "years, how can they say, that till Victor's time the "whole church was of their opinion? Are they not "ashamed to invent this calumny against Victor, who "knew very well, that Theodotus the currier, who was "the first author of the sect of those that deny the "divinity of Christ, was turned out of the church by "Victor himself? For if this bishop had been of the "same mind with Theodotus, how comes it to pass "that he excommunicated him upon the account of his "doctrine?"[7]

These arguments may be sufficient to shew, that, from

[6] "The worship, hymns, and doxologies addressed to the three "persons, as old as Christianity itself, and as unanimously and constantly adhered to, are all so many proofs of the truth of what "we assert, that the blessed Three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "were the God of the primitive Christians."
Fiddes's Theo. Spec. vol. 1. p. 393.

[7] See Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 52.

from what quarter soever the doctrines of Christ's divinity and the holy Trinity might spring, Justin Martyr was not the author and inventor of them.—We will now proceed to examine what those doctrines really were which he embraced and taught to mankind.

59. JUSTIN MARTYR is one of the most eminent Christians and scholars in this period. He was born, A. D. 103, and beheaded at Rome, A. D. 167. His sentiments upon the subjects in question are well known. He is considered as one of the chief champions of the orthodox faith. We will produce a few passages from his valuable writings:—"GOD," says he, "the Father of righteousness, and purity, and every "virtue; HIM *and his* ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON, *together* "*with the* SPIRIT, who spake by the Prophets, *we* "WORSHIP *and* ADORE."[8]

60. "The master who instructed us in this kind of "worship, and who was born for this purpose, and "crucified under Pontius Pilate, is JESUS CHRIST, "whom we know to be *the* SON *of the true God*, and "therefore hold him the *second* in order, and the PRO-"PHETIC SPIRIT the *third*, and we have good reason "for *worshipping* in this subordination, as I shall shew "hereafter. For here they look upon it as a down-"right madness, to assign to a crucified man the next "place to the immutable, eternal God, Parent of all "things, being entirely in the dark as to the mystery "of this order."[9]

61. "We deliver the truth; and nothing but the "truth, and that JESUS CHRIST ALONE *is properly the* "SON *of God*, as being the LOGOS, and FIRST-BEGOT-"TEN, and POWER OF GOD, and by his counsel was "made man."[1]

62. "Lest any one should object, that we can shew "no reason why our Christ should not be looked upon

[8] First Apology, sect. 6.
[9] Ibid. sect. 16.
[1] Ibid. sect. 31.

" as a mere man, I shall enter upon the proof of his " DIVINITY." [2]

63. " They who affirm the SON to be the FATHER, " are guilty of not knowing the FATHER, and likewise " of being ignorant, that the FATHER of the universe " has a SON, who being the LOGOS, and FIRST-BEGOT- " TEN *of God*, is also GOD." [3]

64. " *Next after the unbegotten and ineffable* GOD, " WE ADORE and LOVE him who is the WORD OF GOD; " because that for our sakes he became man, and was " made partaker of our sufferings, that he might heal " us." [4]

65. He speaks of the Son's generation in these words: —" In what has been said already, I have briefly " shewn, that the power, which the word of the pro- " phet calls GOD and ANGEL is not a name only, as " the light of the sun, but numerically another. I said " *this* POWER was *begotten* of the FATHER, by his " power, and counsel, and will, but not by way of ab- " scission, as though the Father's essence was divided; " or such as all other things, which being divided, or " cut, are not the same as before. And I exemplified " in those things which we see set on fire by another, " that other not being diminished thereby, but being " able to set on fire many more, itself remaining the " same." [5]

66. " I can shew, that he (Christ) even pre-existed " the Son of the CREATOR of all things, being GOD, " and was born man through a virgin." *

67. " In the beginning, before all creatures, GOD " *begat* a certain RATIONAL POWER out of himself, " which is also called by the HOLY GHOST the GLORY " of the LORD, and sometimes SON, and sometimes " WISDOM

[2] Ibid. sect. 37.
[3] Ibid. sect. 83.
[4] Apol. 1. prope finem.
[5] Dial. with Trypho, p. 358.
* Ibid. p. 267.

" WISDOM, and sometimes ANGEL, and sometimes " GOD, and sometimes LORD and LOGOS." [6]

68. " That ye might also know GOD, who came " forth from above, and became man among men, and " who is again to return, when they who pierced him " shall see and bewail him." [7]

69. " He, the ALMIGHTY, the CREATOR of all " things, the invisible GOD, he hath planted among " men, and engraved in their hearts, the heavenly " truth, the Word holy and incomprehensible; not " sending, as any one would conjecture, a servant, an " angel, a prince, an earthly potentate, or one to whom " he had entrusted the administration of heavenly " things; but the ARTIFICER and MAKER of all things, " by whom he formed the heavens, and shut in the sea " in its proper bounds; whose mysteries all the ele- " ments faithfully observe, from whom the sun has " received his charge to measure out the day, whom " the moon obeys, when he commands her to shine in " the night, and the stars which follow the course of " the moon; by whom all things are ordered and " bounded, to whom all things are subject, the heavens, " the sea, and all that in them is; the fire, the water " the abyss, what is in the heights, and depths, and be- " twixt them: him he hath sent to them. For what " end? As a man would think, to tyrannize over them; " to awe and terrify them? No; he sent him as a king " sends a king his son, in clemency and meekness. He " sent him as a God. He sent him to men. He sent " him to save; to persuade, not to compel by vio- " lence: for violence is not in God."*

Besides all these, and a vast number of similar declarations, dispersed through this great man's writings, it is most evident that the divinity of Christ, and the other capital doctrines that are connected therewith, were the commonly received principles of the church at

[6] P. 284.——[7] P. 288.

* Epist. to Diognetus.

at that time. For neither in his Apologies, nor yet in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, does he deliver the principles therein laid down as his own private sentiments, but as the avowed sentiments of the great body of believers. And for the truth of them he appeals to the Emperors, to the Jews, and to all the world. His vindication is not so much the vindication of himself and his own opinions, as the vindication of Christ, of all his followers, and of the great, leading, and fundamental truths of his religion.

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION V.

The opinions of the CHRISTIAN FATHERS, who lived in the latter part of the second century, concerning the PERSON of CHRIST, and the doctrine of the TRINITY.

70. TATIAN was a man of eminent learning. After his conversion to Christianity he became a scholar of Justin Martyr, and consequently must have lived about the middle of the second century. And whatever other opinions he might entertain, it is certain he held the doctrine of our Saviour's pre-existence and divinity: for he saith, that "he was born "by communication, not by abscission. For that "which is cut off," says he, "is separated from the "first; but that which hath something in participation, "taking its part of the œconomy, makes not him in-"digent from whom he received it. As many fires "are lighted by one firebrand, and the light of the "first brand is not diminished by giving light to those "many; so the WORD proceeding from the power of "the FATHER, hath not made the FATHER that begat "him without WORD or REASON."[1]

71. ALEXANDER,

[1] Tatian's Orat. cont. Græcos, p. 145.

71. ALEXANDER, the fifth of the seven sons of a certain Christian named Felicitas, who with their mother suffered martyrdom at Rome about the year 150, said to the Judge, "I am a servant of Jesus Christ. Him "I confess with my mouth, in him I believe with my "heart, and him I incessantly ADORE."[9]

72. EPIPODIUS, who with another Alexander suffered martyrdom at Lyons about the year 178, said to the Judge upon that solemn occasion:—"You do not "know that our *eternal* Lord Jesus Christ, whom you "say was crucified, rose again from the dead, who by "an ineffable mystery being both GOD and MAN, hath "marked out for his servants the road to eternal life, "and leads them to heavenly kingdoms."[1]

73. Again:—Having his mouth running with blood, in consequence of the blows given him by order of the Judge, the same Epipodius broke out into this exclamation:—"I confess CHRIST to be GOD with the FA-"THER and the HOLY GHOST, and it is but just I "should lay down my life for him, who is both my "CREATOR and REDEEMER."[2]

74. MELITO was a very learned and laborious man. He was made bishop of Sardis about the year 160. All his works are lost, except one short epistle, and some fragments. From these fragments, however, it fully appears what sentiments he entertained concerning our blessed Saviour:—"There is no necessity," says he, "to prove the real and true human nature of "Christ's soul and body, from his actions after his "baptism. For what was done after his baptism, "especially his miracles, did manifest and confirm to "the world, the DEITY of CHRIST veiled in the flesh. "The same person being *perfect* GOD, and *perfect* "*man*, confirmed to us both these natures; his GOD-"HEAD by the miracles he wrought in the three years "after his baptism, and his *manhood* in the thirty years "before

[9] Ruinart's Acta Sincera Mart. p. 22.
[1] Ibid. p. 64.
[2] Ibid. p. 65.

" before it, in which the imperfection of the flesh con-
" cealed the tokens of his GODHEAD, although he was
" TRUE GOD ETERNALLY."[3]

75. Again:—" We are not the worshippers of
" stones void of sense, but of the only GOD, who is
" before all, and over all, and of his CHRIST, who is
" *truly* GOD *before all ages.*"[4]

76. THEOPHILUS, being a studious, inquisitive man, became convinced of the truth of Christianity, and was made bishop of Antioch about the year of our Lord 168. We have nothing of his remaining, except his books to Autolycus. But from these it is plain he fully acknowledged the doctrines which we now usually call orthodox:—" By the SON of GOD," says he, " we must by all means understand the WORD, al-
" ways existing in the mind of God."

77. Again:—" The three days before the creation
" of the sun and moon were types of the TRINITY,
" of GOD, his WORD, and his WISDOM."

78. Again:—" The WORD was GOD, and *sprung*
" from GOD."

79. Again:—" When the FATHER said, *Let* US
" *make man in our own image*, he spake this to no other
" but to his own WORD, and his own WISDOM."[5]

80. ATHENAGORAS, a learned Athenian philosopher, became a convert to Christianity in the second century. He addressed an Apology in favour of the Christians to the emperors Aurelius and Commodus about the year 180. In this valuable composition, which is still extant, he delivers his sentiments very freely upon the subject in question:—" It is abundantly plain," says he, " that we do not deny the existence of a God:
" we

[3] Anastatii Hodegus, c. 12.

[4] Paschal Chronicle, anno Christi 164.

[5] See his Books to Autolycus, passim.—In making the three first days of the creation typical of the Trinity I do not mean to assert that Theophilus reasoned discreetly; but the observation constitutes a substantial proof of this matter of fact, that he embraced the doctrine of the Trinity.

" we who maintain, there is ONE uncreated, eternal,
" invisible GOD, not subject to passions, not to be
" circumscribed in place, nor capable of divisibility,
" only to be comprehended in the mind, and spirit,
" and endowed with incomprehensible glory, beauty,
" power, and majesty; by whom all things were made
" through his WORD, were disposed in this beautiful
" harmony, and are continually sustained. We believe
" too in the SON of GOD. Let not this be a subject of
" ridicule, because we mention a SON of GOD: we
" have not the same notions of GOD, the FATHER, or
" the SON, as your absurd Poets and Mythologists
" have, who make their gods as foolish and as wicked
" as themselves. The SON of GOD is the WORD of
" the FATHER, in power and energy: by him and
" through him were all things created: for the FA-
" THER and the SON are ONE: the FATHER is in the
" SON, and the SON is in the FATHER, by the unity and
" power of the HOLY GHOST: For the SON of GOD
" is the WISDOM and WORD of GOD. If you desire
" a farther explanation of the meaning of SON in this
" point, I will endeavour to give you a brief one:
" He is the FIRST-BORN of the FATHER, but not as
" ever beginning to exist; for from the beginning,
" GOD, being an eternal mind, must have had, from all
" eternity, the WORD in himself; and as the wisdom
" and power, he exerted himself in all things: all mat-
" ter was subject to him by formation, and the ele-
" ments blended together, and mixed by his operation.
" The prophetical SPIRIT too confirms this: *The Lord*
" *possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his*
" *works of old.* And as for the HOLY SPIRIT, who
" speaks to us in the Prophets, we assert him to pro-
" ceed from GOD, as a beam proceeds from the sun,
" and is reflected back again. Who then can but won-
" der, to hear us charged of Atheism, who declare,
" there is GOD the FATHER, and GOD the SON, and

" the HOLY GHOST; who acknowledge their power " in unity and distinction!" [6]

81. Again:—" We acknowledge GOD, and the SON " his LOGOS, with the HOLY GHOST, ONE as to their " power, even the FATHER, the SON, and the SPIRIT; " the SON to be the *Mind*, the *Word*, the *Wisdom* of " the FATHER, and the SPIRIT to proceed as *light* doth " from *fire*." [7]

82. When ANDRONICUS suffered martyrdom towards the close of the second century, the Heathen judge objected to him, that CHRIST whom he *invocated* and *worshipped* was a *man*, who had suffered under the government of Pontius Pilate, and that the Acts of his passion were then extant. [8]

83. ATHENOGINES suffered martyrdom about the year 196. Basil mentions a sacred hymn, which he ascribes to him as its author. It was expressly addressed to our blessed Saviour, and contained a doxology to the whole TRINITY:—" We laud the FATHER, " SON, and HOLY SPIRIT of GOD." [9]

84. BLANDINA towards the latter end of the second century obtained the crown of martyrdom in France, and is said not to have been sensible of pain, though she was tossed by a wild bull in a net, " *while she made her* " PRAYERS TO CHRIST." [1]

85. IRENÆUS, the disciple of Polycarp, was made bishop of Lyons in France, A. D. 178, and beheaded by Severus, A. D. 202. He wrote an excellent work against the heresies of the age in which he lived, most of which is come down to our own times, though in a very imperfect state. In this celebrated work, however, we find most of the errors which prevail in the present day, concerning the person of Christ, strongly and justly

[6] Legat. pro Christ. p. 10.
[7] Ibid. p. 12.
[8] Baron. an. 190.
[9] Basil de Spirit. Sanct. c. 29. Consult Knowles's Primitive Christianity, p. 45.
[1] Ecc. Hist. of Euseb. b. 5. ch. 1.

ly opposed. This single consideration, methinks, should stagger our zealous Socinians, and make them pause in their opposition to the divinity of our blessed Saviour. I profess before God, that I should be very much alarmed at obstinately and professedly maintaining such principles as this good man [a] clearly condemned

[a] There is a passage recorded by Eusebius, which gives one a very high opinion of the simplicity, sincerity, zeal, and inviolable regard to truth both of Polycarp and this learned and pious Father. It is in a letter which Irenæus wrote to Florinus, who had deviated from the truth to the errors of Valentinus. In this Epistle Irenæus endeavours to reclaim Florinus. "These opinions, O Florinus," said he, "that I may speak sparingly, do not appertain to sound "doctrine. These opinions are dissonant from the church, and "drive those who give their assent to them into the greatest im-"piety. These sentiments even the heretics, who are without the "church, have not dared to publish at any time. These opinions "the presbyters who lived before our times, who also were the dis-"ciples of the apostles, did in no wise deliver unto thee. For I "saw thee, when being yet a child I was in the lower Asia with "Polycarp, behaving thyself very well in the palace, and endeavour-"ing to get thyself well esteemed by him. For I remember the "things then done, better than what has happened of late; for "what we learned, being children, increases together with the mind "itself; and is closely united to it. Insomuch, that I am able to "tell even the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and discoursed; "also his goings out and comings in; his manner of life; the "shape of his body; the discourses he made to the people; the "familiar converse which, he said, he had with John, and with the "rest who had seen the Lord, and how he rehearsed their sayings, "and what they were which he had heard from them concerning the "Lord; concerning his miracles, and his doctrine. According as "Polycarp received them from those, who with their own eyes be-"held the Word of life, so he related them, agreeing in all things "with the scriptures. These things, by the mercy of God be-"stowed upon me, I then heard diligently, and copied them out, "not in paper, but in my heart; and by the grace of God I do "continually and sincerely ruminate upon them. And I am able to "protest in the presence of God, that if that blessed and apostolic "presbyter should have heard any such things, he would presently "have cried out, and stopped his ears, and according to his usual "custom would have said, Good God! for what times hast thou "reserved me, that I should suffer such things! And he would "have run out of the place, where he was either sitting or standing, "should he have heard such words as these. And this may be

demned as heretical. He was evidently both learned, pious, and inquisitive,[3] and was brought up under the venerable Polycarp. Polycarp was the disciple of St. John. St. John was the bosom friend of the Saviour of the world. So that Irenæus was but three removes from Christ himself, and sealed the truth of his doctrines with the blood of his heart. One may, therefore, reasonably suppose, that if Irenæus delivered his sentiments at all upon the principles of religion, he must be very competent to judge what was truth and what was error.[4] But he has delivered his sentiments, and written professedly upon the doctrines then in dispute, and now in dispute between the orthodox and what he calls the heretics, and is decidedly in favour of the former and in opposition to the latter. It ought, therefore, to be something very material indeed on the side of heresy that should determine our minds to embrace it. Nothing less, I think, than absolute demonstration should in this case influence any man. The Ebionites of old, and the Socinians of the present times, are by this pious and learned Martyr considered as fundamentally wrong. No man, I think, should presume to contradict this determination. At least I dare

"manifested from those epistles of his, which he wrote either to "the neighbouring churches to confirm them, or to some brethren "to admonish and exhort them."*

* Ec. Hist, Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 20.

[3] Tertullian says of him, that "he was a most curious investiga- "tor of all kinds of doctrines."

Adv. Valent. ch. 5.

[4] It is evident that he was not only competent to judge, but that he was extremely anxious to have the true principles of religion handed down to posterity. For Eusebius tells us that he added to one of his books this solemn and religious obtestation—"I adjure "thee whoever thou art that shalt transcribe this book, by our "Lord Jesus Christ, and by his glorious coming, wherein he shall "judge the quick and the dead, that thou compare what thou tran- "scribest, and diligently correct it by the copy from whence thou "transcribest it, and that thou likewise transcribe this adjuration, "and annex it to thy copy."

Ec. Hist. book 5. ch. 20.

dare not do it. Let us, however, see what he has advanced upon the subject now under consideration:——
"For the church," says he, "though dispersed through
"the whole world, to the ends of the earth, hath re-
"ceived from the Apostles, and their disciples, this
"faith in ONE GOD, the FATHER ALMIGHTY, who
"hath made the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all
"things in them; and in *one* JESUS CHRIST, THE SON
"OF GOD, incarnate for our salvation; and in *the*
"HOLY GHOST, who preached by the Prophets the
"dispensations of God, and his coming, and his ge-
"neration of the Virgin, and his passion, and resurrec-
"tion from the dead, and the assumption of our be-
"loved Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh into heaven,
"and his coming from heaven in the glory of the Fa-
"ther, to gather all things together, to raise all human
"flesh, that so every knee in heaven, in earth, and un-
"der the earth, may bow, according to the good plea-
"sure of the invisible FATHER, to CHRIST JESUS our
"LORD, and GOD, and SAVIOUR, and KING; and
"every tongue shall confess to him, and he shall ex-
"ecute just judgment in all things. Wicked spirits,
"and sinning angels, unjust, wicked, and blasphemous
"men, and those who have become apostates from
"the truth, he will send into everlasting fire: but up-
"on the just, and upright, and those who observe his
"precepts, and upon such as have persevered from the
"beginning in his love, or have been brought to it by
"repentance, he will freely bestow life everlasting,
"and surround them with eternal brightness." [5]

86. Again:—"This preaching and this faith are
"received and faithfully preserved by the church, as if
"she inhabited one house, though dispersed through-
"out the whole world. She believes these things,
"as having but one soul and one heart, and she
"preaches these things in concord, and teaches and
"delivers them, as having but one mouth; for the
"languages

[5] Lib. 1. ch. 2.

" languages of the world are dissimilar, but the power " of tradition is the same. And neither do the " churches in Germany believe otherwise, or teach " otherwise, nor in Spain, nor among the Celtæ, nor " in the East, nor in Egypt, nor in Libya, nor such " as are established in the middle of the world; but as " the sun created by the Almighty is one and the same " in all the world, so the preaching of the truth ap- " peareth every where, and enlighteneth all men, who " wish to come to the knowledge of the truth; and " neither will he, amongst the governours of the " church, who is very powerful in speech, say things " different from these; for no man is above his master; " nor will he, who is weak in speech, invalidate the " tradition. For as the faith is one and the same, nei- " ther he who can say much usually adds, nor does he, " who can say but little usually diminish." [6]

87. Again:—" Since then we hold the rule of faith, " namely, that there is one GOD ALMIGHTY, who " made all things by his WORD, who filled and framed " them out of nothing into being, as the scripture saith, " *The heavens were made by the* WORD *of the* LORD, " *and all the hosts of them by the* BREATH *of his mouth.* " And again, *All things were made by him, and without* " *him was nothing made.* All things excepts nothing; " but the FATHER made all things by him, whether " visible or invisible, sensible or intelligible, temporary " things for a certain end, or eternal; and since God " made all these things, not by angels, nor some powers " distinct in sentiment from him (for he wants nothing) " but by his WORD and SPIRIT makes, disposes, " governs, and gives existence to all. He who made " the world; (for the world comprehends all things) " he who formed man; he who is the God of Abra- " ham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, be- " sides whom there is no other God, neither beginning, " nor power, nor fulness: he is the FATHER of our " LORD

[6] Ibid. book 1. chap. 3.

" LORD JESUS CHRIST, as we have shewn. There-
" fore holding this rule, though they use many and
" various arguments, we easily prove that they have
" gone off from the truth." [7]

88. Again:—" Suppose the Apostles had left us no
" scriptures, must we not have followed the order of
" tradition, which they committed to those with whom
" they entrusted the churches? To this, many nations
" of the Barbarians, who believe in CHRIST, assent,
" having salvation written in their hearts by the SPI-
" RIT, without letters or ink, and diligently preserving
" the old tradition, believing in one GOD, the MAKER
" of heaven and earth, and of all things in them by
" JESUS CHRIST, the SON of GOD; who, out of his
" exceeding love towards his own creature, suffered
" himself to be born of a virgin, uniting in himself
" man to God, suffered under Pontius Pilate, rose
" again, was received into glory, and shall come again
" the Saviour of those that are saved, and the Judge of
" those that are judged, sending into eternal fire those
" who change the truth, and despise his coming and his
" Father's. They who without letters have believed
" this faith, are, with respect to our language, Bar-
" barians; but with respect to sentiment, moral, and
" conversation, very wise, through faith, and please
" God, living in all justice, chastity, and wisdom.
" To these persons, if any one report the inventions of
" heretics, speaking to them in their own language,
" they quickly shut their eyes, and fly as far as possible
" from them, not enduring to hear their blasphemous
" discourse." [8]

89. Again:—" Neither the LORD, nor the HOLY
" GHOST, nor the Apostles would have definitively and
" absolutely denominated him GOD, who was not GOD,
" nor given this name to any, unless he were the TRUE
" GOD; neither, from their own persons would they
" have called any LORD but GOD, that beareth domini-
" on

[7] Lib. 1. ch. 19.——[8] Lib. 3. ch. 4.

" on over all things, the FATHER and his SON, who " hath received dominion from the FATHER.—Seeing " then that the FATHER is truly LORD, and that the " SON is truly LORD, the HOLY GHOST has deservedly signified them by the appellation of LORD." [9]

90. Again:—" Such is the stability of the Gospels, " that even the Heretics bear witness to it, since each " of them endeavours to confirm his own doctrines by " proofs from those writings. For the Ebionites, " using only the gospel according to St. Matthew, are " by that very thing convicted of error, not conceiving rightly concerning the Lord. Marcion, curtailing the gospel according to St. Luke, may be proved " a blasphemer against the only God, from the parts " which he retains.—

" Being *invisible* he was made *visible*, being *incomprehensible* he became *comprehensible*, being *impassible* he became *passible*, and being the WORD of GOD " he became *man*." [1]

91. Again:—" Having plainly shewn, that the " WORD, which was with GOD in the beginning, by " whom all things were made, and who was always " present to mankind, that he was in the last times, " according to the predetermination of the FATHER, " united to his own creature, being made man capable " of suffering; there is no room for contradiction, who " say, If therefore Christ was then born, he was not " before. For we have shewed that the SON of GOD " *did not then begin to be, having always existed with* " *the* FATHER; but when he was incarnate, and made " man, he took upon himself the sad, forlorn condition " of man, compendiously procuring salvation for us; " that so what we had lost in Adam, the likeness and " similitude of God, we might recover in Christ Jesus. " For since it was impossible that man, who was once " subdued, and thrown off by disobedience, should be " renewed, and receive the reward of victory; and also " impossible

[9] Book 3. ch. 6.——[1] Book 3. ch. 11 and 18.

" impossible that he should obtain salvation, who was " fallen under sin; the SON, who was the WORD of " GOD, descending from the FATHER, and perfecting " the dispensation of our salvation, did both for us." [2]

92. Again:—" That none of the sons of Adam is " called God, as the Lord is called, we have demon- " strated from the scriptures; and to all who have at- " tained but a moiety of the truth, it is obvious, that " he alone of all mankind is denominated GOD, and " LORD, and the eternal King, and the Only-begotten, " and the incarnate WORD, both by the prophets, and " apostles, and the Holy Ghost himself. And these " things the scriptures would not have testified of him, " had he been but a Man as all other men are: but " the holy scriptures testify both these things of him, " that, different from all other men, he alone had in " himself a glorious generation from the most high " Father, and that he also accomplished a glorious " birth of a virgin; that he was a man without beauty, " obnoxious to sufferings, riding on an ass's colt, " drinking vinegar and gall, despised of the people, " and bowing down even to the death; that he was the " holy LORD, the wonderful Counsellor, beautiful in " form, the mighty GOD, coming in the clouds the " Judge of the universe. All these things have the " scriptures prophesied concerning him. For as he " was man that he might undergo temptations; so was " he the WORD that he might receive glory; the WORD " lying dormant that he might be liable to temptation, " and dishonour, and crucifixion, and death; but the " man being taken into the WORD, that in it he might " sustain his sufferings, and conquer, and rise, and be " taken up into heaven." [3]

93. Again:—" They again who say, that he (Jesus) " was merely a man, engendered of Joseph, die; conti- " nuing in the bondage of their former disobedience, " having to the last no conjunction with the WORD of

[2] Lib. 3. cap. 20.
[3] Lib. 3. cap. 21.

" God the Father, nor receiving freedom through the " Son, according to that saying of his own, *If the Son* " *make you free, ye shall be free indeed.* But not know- " ing him, who is the Emmanuel of the virgin, they " are deprived of his gift, which is eternal life. And " not receiving the incorruptible WORD, they continue " in the mortal flesh, and are liable to the natural debt " of death, not accepting the antidote of life."*

94. Again :—" Our Lord redeeming us by his own " blood, and giving his own soul for our soul, and his " own body for our bodies, and pouring out the Spirit " of the Father for the adunion and communion of God " with men, bringing God down to men by the Spirit, " and again, by his incarnation, raising man to God, " and, in his advent, actually and assuredly conferring " on us incorruptibility by communion with God; the " doctrines of heretics fall altogether. For they are " vain, who hold this doctrine.—The Ebionites also, " are vain, not receiving the union of God and man, " by faith, into their soul."*

95. Again :—" All heretics are unlearned, and igno- " rant of the divine dispensations, particularly of the " scheme respecting man, blind to the truth, and " they contradict their own salvation.—Some introduc- " ing another Father beside the Demiurgus. Some " again saying, that the world, and the substance of " it were made by certain angels. Some, that the " substance of the world sprang up from itself, and " is self-produced, far separate from him, who, accord- " ing to them, is the Father. Some, that it took " its substance from corruption and ignorance, being " among the things within the Father. Some treat the " doctrine of our Lord's visible advent with contempt, " not admitting the incarnation. Some, ignorant of the " dispensation of the virgin, say that he was begotten " by Joseph. And some indeed affirm that the eternal " life could neither receive his soul, nor his body, but " only

* Lib. 3. ch. 21.
* Lib. 5. ch. 1.

" only the inward man.—But all these are much later " than those bishops to whom the Apostles delivered " the care of the churches." [5]

I have given the sentiments of this learned bishop and martyr pretty much at large. Considerably more to the same purpose might be selected from the five books of his valuable work. The above quotations, however, will be perfectly sufficient to satisfy the reader what doctrines were esteemed apostolical by this venerable man, and how little dependence can be placed in the most confident assertions of the learned advocate of Socinianism, when he declares, that Irenæus did not consider the Ebionites in the light of heretics. [6]

96. About the close of the second century, or the beginning of the third, flourished CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, the friend of Irenæus, scholar of Pantænus and tutor of the famous Origen. Some of his works are come down to our times, from whence it appears, that he was sound in his principles of the Christian faith. For in the exhortation to the Gentiles, he stiles Christ the living God, that was then worshipped and adored:— " Believe," says he, " O man, in him who is both MAN " and GOD: believe, O man, in him who suffered " death, and yet *is adored as the living* GOD." [7]

97. Again:—In the end of his Pædagogue, he himself addresses his prayers to the Son jointly with the Father, in these words: " Be merciful to thy children, " O Master, O Father, thou Ruler of Israel, O SON, " and FATHER, who are *both one*, our LORD." [8]

98. Again:—Speaking of some words of Plato he saith—" I understand them to be spoken of the HOLY " TRINITY; for the *third* indeed is the HOLY GHOST, " the *second* is the SON, *by whom all things were made*, " according to the will of the FATHER." [9]

99. Again:

[5] Lib. 5. cap. 19.
[6] See Dr. Priestley's View of the Arguments for the Unity of God, p. 21.
[7] Clem. Protreptic. p. 84.
[8] Pædagog. lib. 3. ch. 12. p. 311.——[9] Strom: lib. 5.

99. Again:—"O children, our PÆDAGOGUE is like "to God his FATHER, whose SON he is, without sin—"he is GOD *in the form of man*, immaculate, who exe-"cutes the will of his FATHER, the WORD, GOD, who "is in the FATHER, who is on the right hand of the "Father, and with this form he is GOD."[1]

100. Again:—"There is one FATHER of all things, "one WORD of all things, and one HOLY SPIRIT, "who is every where."[2]

101. Again:—"Let us give thanks to the only "FATHER and SON, to the SON and the FATHER, to "the SON our teacher and master, with the HOLY "SPIRIT; one in all respects; in whom are all things; "by whom all things are one; by whom is "eternal existence; whose members we are; whose "is the glory and the ages; who is the perfect good, "the perfect beauty, all-wise and all-just: *to whom be* "*glory both now and for ever.* Amen."[3]

102. And again:—"This" (namely, the nature of the Son) "is the greatest excellence, which disposes all "things according to the will of the Father, and go-"verns the universe in the best manner, effecting all "things by an indefatigable and inexhaustible power, in "which he so works as to see into hidden thoughts. "For the SON of GOD never leaves his watch-tower, "being not divided, not separated, not moving from "place to place, but being always every where, and no "way circumscribed or limited, all intellect, all his "Father's light, all eye, seeing all things, hearing all "things, knowing all things, searching powers by his "power. To him the whole host of angels and gods "are subject."[4]

All these are authors of the second age, and may be considered the third in succession from the Apostles. Christ taught the Apostles; the Apostles taught Ignatius, Polycarp, and others; Polycarp taught Irenæus and his

[1] Pædag. lib. 1. ch. 2.——[2]
[3] Pæd. lib. 7. ch. 7.
[4] Strom. lib. 7.

his contemporaries. In this short space of time there was no great room for the introduction of erroneous doctrines, especially as the believers of those days were extremely jealous of innovation, and had the sacred oracles in their hands.

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION VI.

The opinions of the CHRISTIAN FATHERS and others, of the third century, concerning the PERSON of CHRIST, and the doctrine of the TRINITY.

THE doctrine of the first and second ages is sufficiently clear and satisfactory. We will now proceed to take a concise view of the doctrine contained in the writings of the third century, where we shall find the same sentiments abundantly confirmed by a still larger number of learned and excellent persons. The first author we will begin with, is,

103. MINUTIUS FELIX. He lived in the beginning of the third century, Cave says about the year 220. In that elegant little work of his, entitled Octavius, he tells us the Christians of his time neither worshipped a criminal nor a mere man for a God. But as they certainly did pay divine honours to Jesus Christ in that age, it follows as a necessary consequence, that they must have considered him as more than human. His words are thus translated:—"Whereas you (Heathen) tax "our religion with the worship of a criminal and his "cross, you are strangely out of the way of truth, to "imagine either that a criminal can deserve to be taken "for a Deity, or that a mere man can possibly be a "God. He surely is miserable in good earnest, whose "hopes all hang upon a mortal; for his whole comfort

" fort expires with the man." This fully implies, that this excellent lawyer considered the Redeemer as more than a mere man.

104. TERTULLIAN[s] was born at Carthage about the year of our Lord 156, became a convert to Christianity, and was baptized, in 196, and, after various revolutions in his religious sentiments, died at the place of his nativity, A. D. 246, in about the 90th year of his age. He was an extraordinary man, and an able writer in defence of the doctrines of the gospel, before he was seduced to Montanism. A few extracts from his writings will satisfy the reader concerning his general principles, though, it must be observed, he is not always consistent with himself.

" That is the rule of faith," saith this learned and eloquent man, " by which we profess what we believe, " namely, that, by which we believe, that there is only " one GOD, and no other besides the Creator of the " world, who made all things of nothing by his WORD " first of all sent forth; that the WORD, called his SON, " appeared variously to the patriarchs in the name of " God, always spoke in the prophets, lastly, was " brought

[s] Mr. Milner in his very valuable History of the Church of Christ, vol. 1. cent. 3. ch. 2. has been, in my opinion, somewhat too severe upon the character and writings of this great man. Making due allowance for his real defects, and the superstitions of the time and place when and where he lived, he was surely a man of very considerable powers, and his writings throw much light upon the history of the age. They may not, they do not, abound with all those evangelical views that might be wished; but yet several of the essential doctrines of the gospel are clearly and strongly defended. Jerome says, that his Apology takes in all the treasures of human learning. Lactantius tells us, that he has fully pleaded the Christian cause. Vincentius acknowledges him to be the smartest, strongest, and most irresistable writer of the age; and that he is such a genius among the Latins, as Origen was among the Greeks. Balsac, his Editor, speaks very highly of him. And even St. Cyprian, of whom Mr. Milner has spoken with so much just approbation, never passed a day without reading some of this great man's writings, and was wont to say, when he called for Tertullian's works, *Give me my master.*

" brought down into the virgin Mary by the SPIRIT " and power of GOD the FATHER, was made flesh in " her womb, and being born of her, became JESUS " CHRIST, from thence preached a new law and a new " promise of the kingdom of heaven, wrought mi- " racles, being fastened to a cross rose again the third " day, being taken up into heaven he sat down at the " right hand of the FATHER, sent the power of the " HOLY SPIRIT to supply his absence, and to influence " those who believe, that he will come with glory to " receive his saints to the enjoyment of eternal life and " the heavenly promises, and to adjudge the wicked to " everlasting fire, when the resurrection of the flesh " shall have taken place. This RULE, *instituted* by " Christ, *admits of no questions among us who are not* " *heretical*, and make the persons concerned in them " heretics." [s]

105. " We believe that there is only one GOD, but " under this dispensation, which we call œconomy, that " the SON his WORD, who proceeded from him, by " whom he made all things, and without whom " nothing was made, is of that one GOD; that he was " sent by the FATHER into the virgin, and born of her, " *man and God, the Son of man and the Son of God*, called " Jesus Christ; that he suffered, died, and was buried " according to the scriptures; that he was raised by the " FATHER, taken into heaven, and seated at the right " hand of the FATHER; that he shall come to judge " both the quick and the dead; that he sent down, ac- " cording to his own promise, the HOLY GHOST the " Comforter from the FATHER, the Sanctifier of all " those who believe in the FATHER, and SON, and " HOLY SPIRIT; that this rule had come down from " the beginning of the gospel, even before any of the " ancient heretics, much more before the modern Prax- " eas; both the late rise of all the heretics in general,

" and

[s] De Præscript. adversus Hæret. p. 73.

" and the novelty of Praxeas in particular, but of " yesterday, will prove." [7]

106. " The FATHER is GOD, the SON is GOD, and " the HOLY GHOST is GOD, and every one of them is " GOD." [8]

107. " The connection of the FATHER in the SON, " and of the SON, in the PARACLETE, makes three " cohering one from the other; which three are one " thing, not one person, as it is said, *I and the Father* " *are one*, with respect to unity of substance, not to sin- " gularity of number." [9]

108. " The name of the FATHER is, GOD AL- " MIGHTY, the MOST HIGH, the LORD OF HOSTS, " the KING OF ISRAEL, WHO IS, as the scriptures " teach. These we say belong to the SON likewise, " and that the SON came in these, and always acted in " them, and so manifested them in himself to men. " *All that the Father hath*, saith he, *is mine*; why then " not his names? Wherefore when thou readest Al- " mighty God, and the most High, and the Lord of " Hosts, and the King of Israel, and He who is; " consider whether the SON be not demonstrated here- " by; who is *in his* OWN RIGHT GOD ALMIGHTY, " *as he is the* WORD *of Almighty God.*" [1]

109. " It is the property of the faith of a Jew, so " to admit the Divine Unity, as not to include therein " the SON, and after him the SPIRIT. For what dif- " ference is there between the Jews and us but this? " What need of the gospel, if it do not clearly hold " out to us the FATHER, the SON, and the SPIRIT, " as constituting the DIVINE UNITY? God hath so " ordered this new sacrament (baptism) that his *Unity* " should now be believed in a new manner, as inclusive " of the SON and of the SPIRIT; and that GOD, whose " Unity was not clearly apprehended, as comprehensive of

[7] Adversus Praxean, cap. 2.
[8] Cont. Prax. cap. 13.
[9] Ibid. cap. 25.
[1] Ibid. cap. 17.

" of the SON, and of the SPIRIT, when he was preached " in time past, might now be openly known according " to his proper names and persons." [a]

110. " We Christians do affirm a spirit to be the " proper substance of the LOGOS, by whom all things " were made, in which he subsisted before he was " spoken out, and was the WISDOM that assisted at the " creation, and the power that presided over the whole " work. The LOGOS or WORD issuing forth from " that spiritual substance at the creation of the world, " and generated by that issuing or progression, is for " this reason called the SON of GOD, and the GOD, from " his unity of substance with GOD the FATHER, for " GOD is a spirit. An imperfect image we have of this " in the derivation of a ray from the body of the sun; " for this ray is a part without any diminution of the " whole, but the sun is always in the ray, because the " ray is always in the sun; nor is the substance sepa- " rated, but only extended. Thus it is in some " measure in the *eternal generation* of the LOGOS; he is " a *Spirit off a Spirit*; a GOD *off* GOD, as one light is " generated by another: the original, parent light, re- " maining entire and undiminished, notwithstanding the " communication of itself to many other lights. Thus " it is that the LOGOS which came forth from God, is " both GOD and the SON of GOD, and those two are " one. Hence it is, that a *Spirit off a Spirit*, or a " GOD *off* GOD, makes another in mode of subsistance, " but not in numericalness or identity of essence; and " so the SON is subordinate to the FATHER as he " comes from him as the principle, but is never sepa- " rated. This ray of God then descended, as it was " foretold, upon a certain virgin, and in her womb was " incarnated, and being there fully formed the GOD- " MAN, was born into the world; the *divine* and *human* " nature making up this person, as soul and body do

[a] Adv. Prax. sect. 31.

" one man.—This is the CHRIST, the GOD of " Christians." [8]

This, and much more than this to the same purpose, is to be found in the writings of this great man. We will now pass on to the works of one that is greater than he.

111. ORIGEN is generally considered as the most learned of all the Christian fathers. He was born at Alexandria, A. D. 185, and after much persecution, and infinite labour in promoting the cause of learning and truth, he died at Tyre, A. D. 253 in the 69th year of his age. Of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, with other points therewith connected, he hath largely spoken, upon various occasions. The following extracts from his works will justify these assertions.

" Whereas there are many, who think they under-
" stand Christianity, and yet some of them differ from
" their ancestors; and whereas the doctrine of the
" church is preserved, being delivered down from the
" Apostles by the order of succession, and remains in
" the churches to this very time, that only is to
" be believed true, which in nothing differs from the
" church's tradition. Now we must know that the
" holy Apostles, when they preached the Christian
" faith, treated very plainly concerning some points,
" which they thought necessary to salvation for all be-
" lievers; though before those who were not forward
" in their search after divine knowledge; leaving the
" reasons of their assertions to be enquired into by
" those, who should be thought worthy to receive from
" the SPIRIT the excellent gifts of the SPIRIT, and es-
" pecially the gifts of the word of wisdom and know-
" ledge. Of other points, they only said, that they
" were, but said nothing how, or whence they were;
" that so all those of their posterity, who were more
" studious than others, and lovers of knowledge and
" wisdom,

[8] Apol. cap. 21.

" wisdom, might have scope for the exercise of their " wit, namely, those who should make themselves " worthy and capable of wisdom. Now the particulars, " which were plainly treated in the apostolical instruc- " tion, are these: First, That there is one GOD, who " made and composed all things, and who made them " out of nothing, &c.—that this GOD, as he had pro- " mised before by his prophets, sent the LORD JESUS " CHRIST in the last days, &c.—then that this JESUS " CHRIST who came, *was born of the* FATHER *before* " *every creature:* that he, when he had ministered to " the FATHER in the creation of all things (for *by him* " *were all things made)* emptying himself in the last " days, *was made man; was incarnate, though* GOD; *and* " *remained* GOD, *though made man.* He assumed a " body like unto our body, with this only difference, " that *he was born of the virgin by the* HOLY GHOST." *

112. " By the gospel it is revealed, that all things " were made by the SON, and that without him nothing " was made. Let him then, who reads understand " from this, that the name of the ALMIGHTY is not " more ancient in GOD than the name of the FATHER; " for by the SON the FATHER is almighty; for through " WISDOM, which is CHRIST, GOD holds the universal " dominion, not only by authority of him who has the " dominion, but even by the spontaneous duty of those " who are subject to him. But that you may confess " that the FATHER and the SON possess one and the " same omnipotence, as he is one and the same GOD " and LORD with the FATHER, hear John in the " Revelation speaking in this manner: *These things* " *saith he, which is, and which was, and which is to* " *come, the* ALMIGHTY. Rev. 1. 8. But who is to " come, the ALMIGHTY, besides CHRIST? As none " should be offended that the FATHER is GOD; and " that the SAVIOUR likewise is GOD; so none should " take offence seeing the FATHER is *almighty*, that it

* Ap. Pamp. Mart. apud opera Jer. vol. 9.

" is also said, the SON is *almighty*. For in this manner " that will be true which he saith to the FATHER, *For* " *all mine are thine, and all thine are mine, and I am* " *glorified in them.* John 17. 10. But if all which be- " long to the FATHER are CHRIST's, among the all " things appertaining to the FATHER is also *omnipotence*, " without doubt the *only-begotten* SON also ought to be " *omnipotent*, that all things which the FATHER hath, " the SON may have also." [4]

113. " Let us describe as well as we can what an " heretic is: Every one who professes to believe in " Christ, and yet says there is one God of the law and " the prophets, and another of the gospels, &c.—Our " opinion must be the same concerning those who " have any false notions of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, " whether according to them, who say he was born of " Joseph and Mary, such are the *Ebionites* and *Valen-* " *tinians*; or according to them who deny him to be " the First-born, the GOD *of the whole creation*, the " WORD, and WISDOM, which is the beginning of the " ways of God, begotten before any thing was made, " before the foundation of the worlds, before all the " hills; *and who say that he is only* MAN." [5]

114. " We worship one GOD, the FATHER and the " SON; and our reasoning stands still in full force " against others; neither do we give divine honour to " an upstart being, as if he had no existence before. " For we believe him when he says, *Before Abraham* " *was, I am*; and again, *I am the truth.* Neither is " any of us of so mean and servile understanding, " as to imagine, that the substance of Truth had not " a being before the appearance of Christ in the flesh. " Therefore we *worship* the FATHER of *Truth*, and " the SON, *who is the Truth*, two things in personal " substance, but one in agreement, and consent, and " identity of will; so that whoever sees the SON, *who* " *is*

[4] Peri Archon, vol. 1.
[5] Com. on Tit. 3. 10.

" *is the brightness of the glory of God, and the express* " *image of his person,* sees GOD in him, as being the " true image of GOD." [6]

115. " We *worship* one GOD, and his only SON, " and WORD, and IMAGE, with supplications and " prayers to the utmost of our power, offering our " prayers to GOD over all by his *only-begotten* SON; " to whom we *first* present them, beseeching him, who " is the propitiation for our sins, as our High-Priest, " to offer our prayers, and sacrifices, and intercessions " to GOD, the LORD *of all things.* Therefore our faith " relies only upon GOD, by his SON, who confirms it " in us. And, therefore, Celsus has no reason or " colour for his charge of sedition, or departing from " God upon the account of his Son; for we *worship* " *the* FATHER, *whilst we* ADMIRE *and* ADORE the SON, " who is his WORD, and WISDOM, and TRUTH, and " RIGHTEOUSNESS, and whatever else we are taught to " believe of the SON of GOD, begotten of such a " FATHER." [7]

116. From the account which is given us by Eusebius of Beryllus, bishop of Bosra in Arabia, we may more fully understand what were the real sentiments of Origen respecting the person of our Saviour. For when this Berryllus had embraced some new doctrines foreign to the faith; " daring to affirm that our LORD " and SAVIOUR, *before his coming among men, had no* " *proper and distinct subsistence*; neither any GOD-" HEAD of his own, but only the DEITY of the FA-" THER residing in him;" he was reproved by Origen for his want of orthodoxy; and being convinced of the error of his new opinions, he was brought back to the true faith. [8]

From

[6] Cont. Cel. l. 8. p. 385.

[7] Ibid. p. 386.

[8] See Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 6. cap. 33.—The learned Fiddes in his Theologia Speculativa gives us the opinions of Origen concerning the nature of Christ in a few words, referring to the several places in his works where the authorities may be found. Origen declares, says this writer, that " Christ is properly Son of God:—

From these several quotations it incontestably appears, that whatever might be the sentiments of this great man concerning the person of Christ, and the doctrine of the Trinity, the opinions of Socinus are so far from receiving countenance, that they are directly condemned.

117. CYPRIAN was born towards the latter end of the second century, converted from Paganism to Christianity, A. D. 246, made bishop of Carthage in 248, and received the crown of martyrdom, A. D. 258. He has given us the most unequivocal declarations of his sentiments on the subjects now under consideration. "Nor did JESUS CHRIST," says he, "our GOD and "LORD, teach us how to behave in this particular by "word only; but his practice accompanied his instruc-"tions, and he led us by example as well as by pre-"cept." [9]

118. "This is our GOD, not the God of all, but of "us Christians only who believe and trust in his "name." [1]

119. "GOD, the FATHER, hath appointed that "*adoration* should be paid to his SON; and the apostle "St. Paul, in conformity to that appointment, hath "expressly told us, that *God hath highly exalted him, "and given him a name, which is above every name; "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of "things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under "the earth.* And in the book of Revelation, we may "observe the angel restraining St. John, who would "have worshipped him, from doing it, saying, *See thou "do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant, and one of thy "brethren; adore the* LORD JESUS. How uncommon "a person must this JESUS be, and with what extraor-"dinary

"Son by nature, and not by adoption:—eternal:—eternally ge-"nerated:—uncreated:—creator: God by nature; the power and "wisdom of God, frequently:—consubstantial:—omnipresent: "immutable:—incomprehensible."

Vol. 1. b. 4. chap. 2. p. 391.

[9] In Pat. sect. 4.

[1] Ibid. sect. 16.

" dinary patience endowed; who, though he be *wor-*
" *shipped* in heaven, is not yet avenged upon earth?" [2]

120. " Daniel, and the three famous youths, ob-
" served more especially the third, the sixth, and the
" ninth hours; three remarkable distinctions, with
" some eye of allusion and regard to the blessed TRI-
" NITY, which was afterwards to be revealed to the
" world in these latter days: for the first hour advanc-
" ing to the third, gives us one notion of a TRINITY;
" the fourth proceeding to the sixth gives us another;
" and last of all the seventh carried on to the ninth,
" exhibits the perfection of the *ternary* number." [3]

This is surely a very fanciful interpretation, and without any just foundation in the meaning of the Spirit; but it shews sufficiently well how strongly the doctrine of the TRINITY was impressed upon the mind of this good man.

121. " Our Saviour hath said, *I and my Father are*
" *one.* And again it is written of the FATHER, SON,
and HOLY GHOST, that *these* THREE *are* ONE." [4]

122. " Of this grace of God, this new œconomy,
" this latter method of salvation, the WORD, and SON
" of God is made the messenger and manager, who
" by all the prophets, go as far backward as you please,
" was spoken of under that character, as a teacher sent
" from God, to enlighten mankind sitting in darkness.
" This is the POWER, the WORD, the WISDOM, the
" GLORY of GOD. He descended into the womb of
" a Virgin, and through the operation of the HOLY
" GHOST, took upon him our flesh; and GOD *by these*
" *wonderous means united himself to* MAN. This CHRIST
" is our GOD, and being a *Mediator* between too, he
" put on the *man*, that he might lead him to GOD his
" FATHER; CHRIST became *man*, that man might be-
" come like CHRIST." [5]

123. " Christ

[2] Ibid. sect. 17.
[3] De Orat. Dom. sect. 21.
[4] De Unit. Ec. sect. 5.
[5] De vanit. idol. sect. 6.

123. "CHRIST was the FIRST-BEGOTTEN and the "WISDOM of the FATHER *by whom all things were* "*made.*" [6]

124. "The *angel* who appeared to the patriarchs is "CHRIST and GOD." [7]

125. "CHRIST is GOD." [8]

126. "CHRIST, who is GOD, was to come, and en- "lighten, and save mankind." [9]

127. CHRIST, though *always* the SON of GOD, was "to be born however according to the flesh." [1]

128. "CHRIST was GOD and MAN, that he might "be the fitter to be a Mediator between them." [2]

129. "We have an advocate with the Father "JESUS CHRIST, our LORD and GOD." [3]

130. "Our Lord after his resurrection instructing "his disciples how they should baptize, says; *All pow-* "*er is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye there-* "*fore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of* "*the* FATHER, *and of the* SON, *and of the* HOLY GHOST. "Here he intimates the TRINITY, in whose sacrament "the nations were to be baptized. Does Marcion be- "lieve this TRINITY? Does he believe the same FA- "THER the CREATOR, as we believe in? Does he ac- "knowledge the same one SON CHRIST, born of the "virgin Mary; who, being the WORD, was made flesh, "and suffered for our sins? Marcion and all other he- "retics hold a very different faith." [4]

131. "If any one could be baptized among the "heretics, he might also obtain remission of sins: and "if he obtained remission of sins, be sanctified and "made the temple of God. I ask, Of what God? "If of the Creator; he could not, who did not be- "lieve in him: if of Christ; neither could he be his "temple, *who denies* CHRIST *to be* GOD: if of the "Holy Spirit, *since these three are one*; how could the "HOLY SPIRIT be reconciled to him, who is an enemy "to the FATHER and the SON?" [5] It

[6] Test. adver. Jud. lib. 2. sect. 1.—[7] Ibid. sect. 5.—[8] Ibid. sect. 6.—[9] Ibid. sect. 7.—[1] Ibid. sect. 8.—[2] Ibid. sect. 10.—[3] Epis. 11. —[4] Apud. Ep. 73.—[5] Ibid.

It is not meant to justify the reasonings of the several passages which are produced in this treatise, whether from the Jews, the Heathens, or the Christian fathers; but only to prove *this matter of fact*, that the doctrine of the Trinity, in a light more or less obscure, was taught by these several denominations of men.

132. GREGORY, bishop of Neocæsarea, was the disciple, and the glory of the famous Origen. He was made bishop in 239, and died in peace, A. D. 265. His Creed is well known. "There is one GOD," says he, "the FATHER of the living WORD, the subsisting "WISDOM, and POWER, and eternal CHARACTER; the "perfect Begetter of him that is perfect, the FATHER "of the *only-begotten* SON, one LORD alone off him "who is alone; GOD off GOD; the impress and image "of the Deity, the *effective* WORD. The WISDOM "which comprehends the constitution of the universe, "and the POWER which made the whole creation; *true* "SON *of the true* FATHER; *invisible off invisible, incor-* "*ruptible off incorruptible, immortal off immortal, and* "*eternal off eternal.* And one HOLY SPIRIT, who hath "his existence from GOD, and who appeared by the "SON, namely, to mankind. The *image* of the SON, "*perfect off perfect*, the LIFE, the AUTHOR of the living, "the holy FOUNTAIN, HOLINESS, and the giver of "sanctification, in whom God the Father is manifested, "who is over all, and God the Son who is through "all. The perfect TRINITY, not divided or alienated "in glory, eternity and kingdom. There is, therefore, "nothing created, nothing servile, in the TRINITY. "Nothing superinduced, that was not before, but came "in afterwards. *The* FATHER *always had a* SON, *and* "*the* SON *a* SPIRIT. *There was always the same* "TRINITY *without change or turning.*"

133. Again:—"Let us commit hymns and praises "to the KING and CREATOR of *the universe*, the suffi- "cient fountain of all good things, to him who herein "heals our infirmities, and is alone able to supply our "defects, to the PRINCE and SAVIOUR of our souls, to

" his first-begotten WORD, the CREATOR and GOVERN-
" OR of all things; since he alone can send up to the
" FATHER perpetual and incessant thanksgivings for
" himself, and for us all, particularly and universally.
" For he being the TRUTH, the WISDOM and POWER
" of the FATHER of all things; furthermore, being in
" him, and naturally united to him, it is not possible,
" that out of forgetfulness or imprudence, or any infirmi-
" ty, like one who is remote from him, he should either
" not reach the Power of powers, or though he can,
" should voluntarily (which is not to be supposed)
" omit it. He only is able perfectly to fulfil all that
" dignity of praises which belong to him; he whom
" the Father of all things having united to himself, he
" himself only not containing himself in him, hath in
" a certain manner honoured with an every way equal
" power to that of his own; and is honoured by him,
" which he the first and only one of all beings hath ob-
" tained, he the ONLY-BEGOTTEN, GOD THE WORD in
" him.—*The most perfect, the living, the animate* WORD
" *of him, the first* MIND." [6]

134. DIONYSIUS ALEXANDRINUS studied under Origen, was made bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 247, and died there in 265. He calls Christ—UNCREATED and
" the CREATOR—GOD BY NATURE, the WORD of
" the *Father—consubstantial with the* FATHER.—CHRIST
" is *immutable*, as *being* GOD *the* WORD.—CHRIST *is*
" GOD *over all*, our refuge.—JESUS CHRIST, *who is*
" GOD *over all*, the LORD *and* GOD *of Israel*.—He
" shall not escape unpunished, who blasphemes the be-
" nevolent SPIRIT: for the SPIRIT is GOD." [7]

135. " TO GOD, even the FATHER, and his SON our
" LORD JESUS CHRIST, with the HOLY GHOST, be
" glory and power, forever and ever. Amen." [8]

136. DIONYSIUS ROMANUS was made bishop of Rome, A. D. 259, and died in 269. Nothing of his remains

[6] Opera Greg. Thaumat. passim.
[7] Epist. adv. Paul. passim.
[8] Frag. apud Basil.

remains but some fragments, in which he says:—" I " may justly speak against them, who divide, split, and " destroy the most venerable doctrine of the church of " God, making the monarchy three certain powers, " separate subsistences, and three Deities. For I am " persuaded that some of the catechists and preachers " of God's word teach this opinion; men diametrically " opposite to the heresy of Sabellius. For he blas- " phemes in saying that the Son is the Father; they, " the other hand, preach up three Gods, after a sort, " dividing the Holy One into three hypostases, alien " from one another, and wholly separate. For it is " necessary that the DIVINE WORD be united to the " GOD of the universe. The HOLY GHOST also must " closely adhere to and abide in GOD. And it is also " absolutely necessary that the sacred THREE be sum- " med up, and gathered together into ONE, as a certain " centre, that is, into the almighty GOD of the uni- " verse."

137. " It is no common, but the greatest blasphemy, " after a sort to say, that the LORD was made with " hands."

138. " We ought not either to divide the wonderful " Divine Unity into three Deities, or to mutilate the " dignity and the excellent greatness of our Lord, " by saying, that he is created; but to believe in God " the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his Son, " and in the Holy Ghost, and to believe that the " WORD is united to the GOD of the universe. For, " says he, *I and the Father are one:* and, I in the " Father, and the Father in me: so would the DIVINE " TRINITY, and the sacred doctrine of the monarchy " be preserved." [9]

139. CAIUS, the presbyter of Rome, lived about the middle of the third century; and we are told by Photius, that " he spake exactly of the *divinity* of CHRIST, our " *true* GOD; he both called him by the name CHRIST,

[9] Frag. apud Athan.

" and unexceptionably described his ineffable generation " from the FATHER." [1]

140. This same CAIUS observes, that " there were " anciently many psalms and hymns composed by the " brethren, and transcribed by the faithful, setting forth " the praises of CHRIST as the WORD of GOD, and as- " cribing *divinity* to him." [2]

141. HIPPOLITUS, the martyr and bishop of Portua, was the disciple of Clemens Alexandrinus, and flourished about the year 220. In the few fragments of his works which remain, he says:—" The *Divinity* is such after " the incarnation, as it was before, in nature infinite, in- " comprehensible, without passions, change or varia- " tion, power itself, and, to say all, essentially subsist- " ing, and the only infinitely powerful good."

142. " TO HIM (Christ) be glory and strength, to- " gether with the FATHER and the HOLY SPIRIT, in " the holy church, now and forevermore. Amen." [3]

143. " If the WORD was with GOD, being GOD, " why shall any one object that we talk of two Gods? " I will not declare two Gods but one, yet two per- " sons."

144. " The FATHER is one, but there are *two* per- " sons, because there is a SON, and the *third* is the " HOLY GHOST.—We cannot think otherwise of God " as one, unless we believe really in the FATHER, the " SON, and the HOLY GHOST.—Whoever should " leave out any *one* of the *three*, would not glorify God " perfectly, for the FATHER is glorified by this TRI- " NITY, seeing the FATHER willed, the SON effected, " the SPIRIT manifested." [4]

145. " We can have no right conception of the one " God, but by believing in a real FATHER, SON, and " HOLY GHOST. [4] "

146. " He

[1] Apud Bibliothecam.
[2] Ec. Hist. Euseb. c. 5. l. 28.
[3] Apud Anast. Bib.——*Hipp. c. Noet. p. 20. Ed. Fabricii.
[4] Cont. Noetum, passim.

146. "He is said to be exalted, as having wanted it "before; but in respect only of his humanity. And he "has a *name given him*; as it were a matter of favour, "*which is above every name*, as the blessed Paul expresses "it. But in truth and reality, this was not the giving "him any thing, which he naturally had not from the be-"ginning. So far from it, that we are rather to esteem "it his returning to what he had in the beginning essenti-"ally and unalterably; on which account it is, that he, "having condescended to put on the humble garb of hu-"manity, said, *Father, glorify me with the glory which I "had with thee before the world was:* For he was always "invested with divine glory, having been coexistent with "his Father before all ages, and before all time, and the "foundation of the world."[5]

147. About this period lived AFRICANUS, a man, as Eusebius says, expert in all manner of knowledge and literature. A doxology of his is still extant:—"We "render thanks to HIM who gave our LORD JESUS "CHRIST to be a Saviour, to *whom* with the HOLY "GHOST be glory and majesty forever."[6]

148. PAULUS SAMOSATENUS, bishop of Antioch, denied the divinity of our Saviour in the third century. Against him was held one or more councils at Antioch. Six bishops of that age wrote to the said Paulus an epistle to dissuade him from his erroneous opinions, which epistle is still extant. In this letter they trace the divinity of Christ up to the times of the Apostles, and then assert this to be the true apostolical faith concerning the person of our blessed Lord; namely, "That he is the WISDOM, the WORD, and "the POWER of GOD, existing before ages, not in "foreknowledge, but in essence and subsistence, GOD "and the SON of GOD."[7] The names of these six "bishops

[5] Hipp. vol. 2. p. 29.
[6] Basil de Sp. Sancto, c. 29.
[7] Apud Bibl. Patrum, tom. 11. See too Eccl. Hist. of Euseb. b. 7. c. 30.

bishops were Hymenæus, Theophilus, Philotecnus, Maximus, Proclus, and Bolanus.

149. NOVATIAN, the presbyter of Rome, lived about the middle of the third century. He wrote a treatise on the Trinity, which is usually considered as agreeable to the commonly received doctrine. In this treatise are to be found many valuable remarks upon the subject now under consideration. "The scripture," says he, "as well declares GOD CHRIST as MAN GOD. "It has as well described the *man Jesus Christ, as the* "*God Christ our Lord.* For it doth not only propose "him, as the *Son of God*, but *of man also*; so that "being off both, he is both, lest if he was only one, "he could not be the other. For as nature has taught, "that we should think him to be really in nature man, "who is off man; so the same nature hath taught, "that we should believe him to be God, who is off "God; lest, if he should not be God, though off God, "he should not also be man, though off man: and "both of them should be in hazard, each from the "other, whilst the one is shewn to destroy the credit of "the other." [8]

150. "If Christ is only a man; how is he present "wherever he is called upon, since this is not the na- "ture of man, but of God, to be present in every "place? If Christ is only a man; why is the man in- "voked as a mediator in our prayers, since the invoca- "tion of a man to procure salvation must be judged "ineffectual? If Christ is only a man; why do we "place our hope in him, since *cursed is the hope that* "*is placed* only *in man*?" [9]

151. "If Christ were only a man, how could he say, "*I and my Father are one*? For how is it, *I and my Fa-* "*ther are one*, if he be not both SON and GOD? who may "therefore be said to be one, as he is from him, and as "he is his Son, and as he is begotten of him, and as "he came from him, by which he is *very God.*" [1]

152. "Whereas

[8] De Trinit. sect. 31.
[9] Ibid. sect. 14.——[1] Cap. 23.

152. "Whereas it is the property of none but God "to know the secrets of the heart, and yet Christ "knows what is in man: whereas it is in the power "of none but God to forgive sins, yet Christ doth "forgive sins: whereas it is of no man to come down "from heaven, and yet he descended from thence: "whereas no man could utter that saying, *I and my* "*Father are One*, and Christ alone, from a conciousness of his own divinity, did say it: and whereas, "finally, the apostle Thomas, furnished as he was with "every proof of Christ's divinity, said in answer to "him, *My Lord, and my God:* whereas the apostle St. "Paul writes in his Epistle, *Whose are the fathers,* "*and from whom, according to the flesh, Christ came,* "*who is over all God blessed forevermore:* whereas the "same apostle declares, that he was made such, *not* "*by man*, or through man, *but through Jesus Christ*: "whereas he contends that he learned the gospel, *not* "*of men, but by Jesus Christ*: upon all these accounts "we must conclude, that CHRIST IS GOD."[2]

153. THEOGNOSTUS ALEXANDRINUS lived sometime in the third century and was the disciple of the great and justly celebrated Origen. A fragment of his, which still remains, bears ample testimony to the orthodoxy of his opinions on the subject before us:—"The "essence of the Son, says he, "is not something ex"ternally invented, nor something brought into being "from nothing; but it came from the essence of the "Father, as splendor from light, or vapour from water. "For neither the splendour nor vapour, is the very "water, or the sun, nor is the essence of the Son "something different from the Father, but the efflux "of the Father's essence, that same essence of the Father not admitting division. For as the sun remains "the same, and is not lessened by the rays it sends "forth, so the essence of the Father undergoes no "change, though it sends forth the Son, its image."[3]

154. LUCIAN

[2] Ibid. c. 13.
[3] Apud Athan.

154. LUCIAN, the martyr, was a presbyter of the church of Antioch, in the third age, and a very eloquent and learned man. His creed is said to have been as follows:—"We believe agreeably to evangelical and "apostolical tradition, in one GOD, the Father Al- "mighty, Creator and Maker of all things; and in "one Lord Jesus Christ; his only-begotten Son, GOD, "by whom all things were made, begotten of the Fa- "ther before all worlds, God off God, Whole off "Whole, Alone off Alone, Perfect off Perfect, King "off King, Lord off Lord; the living Word, Wis- "dom, Life, the true Light, the Way of truth, the "Resurrection, the Shepherd, the Door, Immutable "and Unchangeable, the exact Image of the Godhead, "the Essence, Power, Counsel, and Glory of the Fa- "ther, the First-born of every creature, who was in "the beginning with God, GOD the WORD, as it is "written in the gospel, *The Word was God; by whom "all things were made*, and in whom all things consist, "who in the last days came down from heaven, and "was born of the virgin according to the scriptures: "and in the HOLY GHOST, which was given to the "believers for their consolation, sanctification and per- "fection; as our Lord Jesus Christ commanded his "disciples, saying, *Go ye therefore, disciple all nations, "baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, "and the Holy Ghost*; namely, of the FATHER, who is "truly Father; of the SON, who is truly Son; and of "the HOLY GHOST, who is truly Holy Ghost: the "words not being simply words, and of no significa- "tion, but accurately denoting the subsistence of "every one named, and their glory and order; so that "they are in subsistence *three*, in consent *one*." [4]

155. METHODIUS was a bishop of Tyre in the third age, and a martyr in the Dioclesian persecution. He wrote many things, but few of his pieces are now in being. It appears, however, from what remains of his

[4] Apud Athan.

his works, that he was orthodox in the faith of the Son of God: For thus he speaks of the Word:—— "Though he was GOD, he took upon him human "flesh, for this purpose, that we beholding the divine "exemplar of his life set before us as in a table, might "imitate the exactness of a painter in copying it."

156. "Christ, the man, was full of the pure and "perfect divinity, and as GOD, was after some sort in-"cluded in the man."

157. "For that *he was, and truly is* GOD, existing "in the beginning with God, and existing as God, "Governour and Pastor of the heavenly world, &c.[3]

158. PORPHYRIUS, a martyr of Palestine, and one of the scholars of Pamphilus, about the middle of the third century, when he was surrounded with flames, we are told, "*called* upon JESUS, the SON of GOD, to "be his helper," and with those words gave up the ghost.[4]

159. In the same year ACACIUS, bishop of Antioch, being carried before the president Martian, said to him: "If you think yourself bound to obey a man, who in "a short time must leave the world, and his body be-"come the food of worms: how much more strictly "am I bound to obey the *most powerful* GOD, who lives "forever, and who has said, *He that shall deny me be-"fore men, him will I deny before my Father who is in "heaven.*" Martian then said; "You have now all "at once confessed that error of your people, which "I always wished to be informed of. Has then God "a Son? A. He has. Q. Who is this Son of God? "A. The WORD of truth and grace. Q. Is that his "name? A. You did not ask me his name, but who "he is. Q. Tell me his name. A. He is called "Jesus Christ."[5]

160. In the Acts of the martyrdom of Nicephorus,

[3] Apud Bibliothecam, Tom. 3.
[4] Euseb. Mart. of Palestine, ch. 11.
[5] Ruinart's Acts of the Martyrs, p. 141.

who suffered about the year 260, it is related, that SAPRICIUS, who was first apprehended, was asked by the Governour, "Of what profession are you? A. I "am a Christian. Q. Are you of the clergy? A. "I have the honour of being a priest."—He then added, "We Christians acknowledge Christ for our "Lord and Master; because he is the *true* GOD, and "the CREATOR *of heaven and earth, and of all things* "*therein.*" [6]

161. In the year 250, PIONIUS, a priest of Smyrna, as also SUBINA, and ASCLEPIADES, were apprehended and carried before Polemon, and being asked what God he adored? Pionius answered:—"The almighty God who "created the heaven and earth, and all things therein, "who hath made himself known to us by his WORD, "Jesus Christ." The President then addressing himself "to Asclepiades, asked: What are you? A. A Chris-"tian. Q. Of what church? A. Of the catholic "church. Q. What GOD do you worship? A. "CHRIST. What then, said Polemon, is that another "God?" To which Asclepiades replied: "No, he is "the same God whom they have just now confessed."

When they were brought again before the Judges, these asked, "Why do you not sacrifice? A. Because "we are Christians. Q. What God do you worship? "A. Him who made the heavens and adorned them "with lucid orbs; who made the earth and decked it "with flowers and trees, and fixed the bounds of the "sea. Q. Do you mean him who was *crucified?* A. "Yes, I mean him whom the Father sent for the sal-"vation of the world." [7]

162. PIERIUS, a presbyter of the church of Alexandria, flourished in the third age, and was a man of great eminence. His works are all lost; but Photius tells us, that he was *perfectly sound in the article of Christ's divinity.*

Such

[6] Ibid. p. 246.
[7] Ruinart's Acts of the Martyrs, p. 128.

Such is the evidence of the three first ages to the divinity of Christ, and those other doctrines which are therewith connected; from whence it appears that these Fathers acknowledged the eternity and divinity of the Word, and of the Holy Ghost, with the Trinity of persons in the one living and true God. Whether they were right in so doing makes no part of our present enquiry. The matter of fact is all we are concerned to prove. The Holy Scriptures alone must determine the validity and importance of doctrines.[8]

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION VII.

Opinions of the CHRISTIAN FATHERS, and others, who flourished in the fourth, and beginning of the fifth centuries, concerning the PERSON of CHRIST, and the doctrine of the TRINITY.

THE sentiments of the primitive Christians, who lived sometime before the Council of Nice, have been detailed pretty much at large; we will now proceed to lay before the reader a short view of the opinions, which prevailed on these great subjects, immediately before, during the time of, and for some years after, that important period.

163. In the beginning of the fourth century a whole city in Phrygia, men, women, and children, were all burnt to death in a church, as they were at their devotions, "calling upon CHRIST, the GOD *over all*."[9]

164. St. FELIX, who suffered death at the same

[8] There is a good abridgment of the doctrines of the three first ages in the first vol. of Dupin's New History of Ecclesiastical Writers, p. 179.

[9] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. l. 8. cap. 11.

time, under the Dioclesian persecution, prayed in the manner following, during his last great conflict:—"O "LORD GOD of heaven and earth, *Jesus Christ*, I bow "my neck to thee as a sacrifice, who livest to all "eternity; to whom belong glory and magnificence "forever and ever. Amen."[1]

165. In the Acts of THELICA, who suffered about the same time, we have this prayer:—"I give thanks "to the God of all kingdoms. Lord Jesus Christ, "we serve thee. Thou art our hope. Thou art the "hope of Christians. Most holy God, most high "God, God almighty, we give thanks to thee for thy "great name."[2]

166. VITALIS, a martyr in this century, St. Ambrose tells us, made this his last prayer:—"*O Lord* "*Jesus Christ*, my SAVIOUR and my GOD, command "that my spirit may be received; for I desire to ob-"tain the crown, which thy holy angel hath shewed "me."[3]

167. VICTOR, who suffered death for the faith of Christ at Marseilles, about the year 303, in his speech to the President said, "How worthy is he of our love "and our adoration, who, when we were his enemies, "loved us first, and in order to rescue us, *remaining* "GOD, *he became man*, not diminishing his divinity, "but cloathing himself with our humanity."[4]

168. When EUPLIUS was suffering under the torments inflicted on him by his persecutors, Calvisianus said to him:—"Euplius, lay aside this madness, wor-"ship the gods, and you shall be set at liberty." To which he replied; "*I adore* CHRIST, I detest devils. "I adore the FATHER, and the SON, and the HOLY "GHOST. I adore the holy TRINITY, besides which "there is no GOD."[5]

169. AFRA

[1] Baron. Annals, 302.
[2] Ibid. 303.
[3] Exhort. ad Virg, vol. 1. p. 105.
[4] Ruinart, p. 304.
[5] Ibid. p. 439.

169. AFRA was burnt at Augsburgh in 304. When tied to the stake she prayed in the following words:—"O almighty LORD GOD, JESUS CHRIST, *who camest not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance*, &c."—And, when fire was put to the faggots, she prayed again in these words:——"O LORD JESUS CHRIST, I give thee thanks, that thou hast vouchsafed, &c. I offer this sacrifice of myself to THEE, who with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST livest and reignest GOD, world without end. Amen."[6]

170. In the same year, 304, FAUSTUS, JANUARIUS, and MARTIALIS, who suffered at Cordova, said to EUGENIUS:—"We are Christians, who confess Christ, who is the *one* LORD, *by whom we and all things were made.*"—Martialis said, "CHRIST is my comfort, whom they with joy and exultation have confessed. For *there is one only* GOD, the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, to whom praise and glory are due."[7]

171. About the year 306, Phileas, bishop of Thumis in Egypt, was sent prisoner to Alexandria; and being asked by the president Culsianus, "Is CHRIST GOD? He replied, YES. Q. Was GOD crucified? A. He was crucified for our salvation. Q. Was Paul God? A. No; he was a man like unto us: but the Spirit of God was in him, and wrought many signs and wonders by him."[8]

172. QUIRINUS, bishop of Siscia, who suffered in the year 309, being asked by Maximus, "Why did you run away?" replied, "I did not run away, but obeyed the command of my LORD: for it is written, *If they persecute you in one city flee into another.* Q. Who commanded this? A. CHRIST, who is TRUE GOD."[9]

173. PETER, bishop of Alexandria, died a martyr about-

[6] Ibid. p. 502.
[7] Ibid. p. 597.
[8] Ibid. p. 549, 550.
[9] Ibid. p. 552.

about the year 311. From some small remains of his it appears, that he was sound in the faith concerning the Son of God. "The WORD being made flesh," says he, "by the will of God, and found in fashion as a "man, was not deserted by the DIVINITY."

174. "God the WORD, in the absence of man, "according to the will of God, who is able to do all "things, was made flesh in the womb of the virgin, "not standing in need of the presence, or operation "of man."

175. "And he said to Judas, *Dost thou betray the "Son of man with a kiss?* These things, and the like, "and all the signs he did, and the powers shew that he "was GOD, and was made man. Both points then are "demonstrated, that he was GOD *by nature*, and that "he was *man by nature*."[1]

176. ARNOBIUS flourished in the very beginning of the fourth century. Seven books of his against the Gentiles are still extant, from which we learn that his sentiments, concerning the person of Christ, were much the same with those we have already produced. "Ought we not," says he, "to look upon CHRIST as "GOD, and *worship* him with truly divine worship, "from whom we have already received so many bles-"sings; and expect he will bestow much greater bles-"sings on us hereafter?—Perhaps some one in a rage "may say, *Is Christ then God? Yes*, we will answer, "*he is God*,—and was sent to us for a most important "cause.—He was *the sublime* GOD, GOD *from his in-"ternal root* or generation; and, *being God*, was sent "*by God his eternal Father to be the Saviour*."[2]

177. "If Christ was God, why was he seen in the "form of man, and killed after the manner of man? "Answer: Could that invisible power, that incorpo-"real substance otherwise communicate himself to the "world, and be present at the councils of men, than by

[1] Annot. of Grabe on the Works of Bull, p. 172.
[2] Adv. Gentes, lib. 1.

" by assuming some covering of more solid matter, " which might receive the darted ray of the eye, and " upon which our dull sight might fix? What mortal " is there that could see him, that could behold him, " if he should give himself to the world, such as he in " his primogenial nature is, such as he would have " been in his own quality, in his Deity? He, therefore, " took upon him the form of a man, and veiled his " power under the similitude of our kind, that he " might be seen and beheld." [3]

178. " But he was killed after the manner of men. " Not he himself. For the Divinity is not subject to " death; nor can that which is one, simple, and not " made of any parts, be destroyed by dissolution. " Who then was seen to hang upon the cross, who died? " The man which he put on, and carried about with " him." [4]

179. A HEATHEN in Arnobius tells him, and in him all the Christians of that age, that the gods were not enemies to them, because they adored the omnipotent God, but because, says he, " *You deify, and with your* " *daily prayers worship a man* that was born, and what " is most infamous, one that was put to death with " vile persons on a cross." [5]

180. LACTANTIUS was the most elegant writer of all the Christian fathers. He was brought up in Paganism, converted to Christianity in the latter end of the third century, and died in 316. He is generally supposed not to be so consistent in his opinions as most of those who preceded him; but he is sufficiently clear and satisfactory upon the pre-existence and divinity of our blessed Saviour. " When we say," replies he to an objection, " GOD the FATHER and the SON, we do " not say different, nor do we separate them both; be- " cause the FATHER *can not be without the* SON, *nor* " *can the* SON *be separated from the* FATHER. For he " can't be called FATHER without a SON, nor can the " SON

[3] Lib. 1.——[4] Ibid.——[5] Ibid.

" SON be begotten without a FATHER. Since, there-
" fore, the FATHER makes the SON, and the SON the
" FATHER, there is one mind, one spirit, one substance
" to them both. But the FATHER is as an overflowing
" fountain; the SON as a stream running from it; who,
" because faithful and dear to his supreme FATHER,
" is not separated, as the river is not from the foun-
" tain, nor the ray from the sun; because both the
" water of the fountain is in the river, and the light of
" the sun in the ray." [6]

181. " The MEDIATOR was to be an example of
" virtue and holiness to his redeemed ones, which he
" could not be as GOD; wherefore he *incarnated him-*
" *self*, to shew by his own conquering of the desires of
" the flesh, that the commission of sin was not neces-
" sary, but voluntary, and by his own pattern to encour-
" age and enable us to overcome the lusts thereof." [7]

182. " The most high God and Parent of all, when
" he would transfer his religion from the Jewish to the
" Christian church, he sent a teacher of righteousness
" from heaven, that so to his new worshippers he
" might by him give a new law; not, as he had done
" before, by man only. Nevertheless he would have
" him born as a man, that so, in all things, he might
" be like the supreme Father. For he, who is GOD
" the FATHER, the original and first principle of all
" things, because he hath no parents, is most truly stiled
" by Trismegistus, Απατωρ και Αμητωρ, without
" father and without mother, as being begotten of
" none. Therefore also it behoved the SON to be twice
" born, that so he might become Απατωρ και Αμητωρ,
" without father and without mother. For in his first and
" spiritual birth he was without mother, being born of
" GOD the FATHER only, without the office of a
" mother; but, in his second and carnal generation, he
" was without father, being conceived in a virgin's
" womb, without the intervention of a human father:
" that

[6] Lib. 4. cap. 29.
[7] Ibid. cap. 25.

" that so, having a middle substance between God and " man, he might, as it were by the hand, conduct this " frail and infirm nature of ours to immortality. He " was made both the SON of GOD, through the spirit, " and the SON of MAN, through the flesh; that is to " say, *he is both* GOD AND MAN. The divine power " appeared in him by the works which he did: the " frailty of man appeared by the sufferings he under- " went." [8]

183. " That he was both GOD AND MAN, com- " pounded of two natures, we learn from the prophets, " in their predictions concerning him." [9]

All these authors lived, wrote, and finished their mortal career, before the Council of Nice. This is allowed by every party. Let any man judge then, what credit is due to Mr. Lindsey when he says—— " If the matter is to be put to the vote as it were, it is " absolutely necessary, that the less learned should be " told, what upon enquiry will be found to be un- " deniably true, namely, that the Fathers of the three " first centuries, and consequently, all christian people, " for upwards of three hundred years after Christ, till " the Council of Nice, were generally Unitarians, what " is now called either Arian or Socinian." [1] How can you advance such an assertion, Mr. Lindsey? What lengths will not false zeal for a party carry even worthy men? As an honest man, and a lover of truth, you ought assuredly to retract this declaration. This I do not find you have ever yet done, though Mr. Burgh with such abundant evidence has proved the falsehood of it, and though your friend Dr. Priestley was so far convinced of the invalidity of it as to declare, " he allows all that bishop Bull and Mr. Burgh ascribe " to the Fathers of the second and third century; I " allow," says he, " that they held the doctrine of " the divinity of the Son at least; but it was in a

[8] Lib. 4.——[9] Ibid.——[1] Apology, p. 23, 24.

" qualified sense, and by no means the same that was " maintained after the Council of Nice."

Be it as it may, the reader has now Mr. Lindsey's assertion, and the several declarations of the Fathers of the three first centuries before him, he will therefore be competent to judge for himself on what side the truth lies.

184. ALEXANDER became bishop of Alexandria in the year 313. In his time, and in his church, Arius arose, who denied the divinity of Christ. Alexander called a council of the bishops of Egypt and Lybia, in number about one hundred, to consider of the business, and they wrote a letter to the bishops of the neighbouring countries, in which they make use of these words:—" What these (Arius and his adherents) " have taught contrary to the scriptures, is—that God " was not a Father—that the Word of God did not " exist from all eternity—that there was a time when " the Son did not exist—and that he was created out " of nothing."—Then Alexander and his brethren add —" Whoever heard such things as these; or, if he " should happen to hear them, would not be astonished, and stop his ears that he might not hear them? " Or who is there that will not condemn these, when " he hears John saying, *In the beginning was the* WORD, " —and, *by* HIM *all things were made?*" [2]

185. EUSEBIUS, bishop of Cesarea in Palestine, was born about the year 265, and died in 340, aged 75. He was an active member of the Council of Nice, and has written pretty largely upon the subjects of our enquiry. But as we have already quoted him on former occasions, we shall only produce in this place two or three short passages from his works.

" The SON is the one perfect and only-begotten GOD " off GOD—a second light like in all things to himself. " —The generation of the Son is above all comparison, and not after the manner of any natural bodies. " —The

[2] Socrates's Ec. Hist. l. 1. cap.. 6.

" —The Son was begotten, not being for any time " without existence, and afterwards made, but existing " and pre-existing before everlasting ages, and co-ex- " isting always as a Son with the Father, and not be- " ing unbegotten, but begotten of the unbegotten " Father, being the only-begotten WORD, and GOD off " GOD, not emitted from the substance of the Father " by any separation, section, or division, but receiving " his essence by the ineffable and incomprehensible will " and power of the Father, in a manner not to be ex- " pressed, or comprehended by us, from all ages, or " rather before all ages." [3]

186. " That he who spake to Abraham and Moses " was the SON of God," says this excellent writer, " is plain from his own words to Moses, when he said, " I am the Lord that was seen by Abraham, Isaac, and " Jacob: so that he positively assures us that he was " seen by the Patriarchs. And, indeed, this is suffici- " ently told us in the ancient history; as when he is " said to have appeared to Abraham in Mamre, as he " sat at the door of his tent. In what shape is also " told us—that he appeared as a man. Now that this " was no other than the SON of God, our Lord himself " assures us, when he says—*Abraham saw my day, and* " *he rejoiced to see it;* adding to their further astonish- " ment, *For before Abraham was, I am.* Where it is " plain, he fully asserts his pre-existence. And this he " insinuates to Moses, when he calls himself, I AM THAT " I AM. And therefore the apostle Paul doth justly " own him to be the mediator between God and the " Israelites, when he says; *The law was given by* " *angels in the hand of a mediator.* So that this was the " mediator that spake to Moses even before he became " man. Even as the same apostle tells us, when he " says: *There is* but *one Mediator between God and* " *man, the Lord Jesus Christ.*" [4]

187. J. FIRMICUS

[3] Euseb. Demon. Evan. l. 4. c. 2.
[4] Cont. Marcel. l. 3. c. 21.

187. J. FIRMICUS MATERNUS presented a treatise on the errors of the Gentile religions to the emperors Constantius and Constans in the year 342. In this treatise he applies the twenty fourth psalm to the Son of God in the manner of Justin Martyr. He calls Christ "GOD," and "the ALMIGHTY GOD"—says that "the "sin of Adam could only be compensated for by such "a propitiation as Christ became for us;" that therefore "the WORD of God united himself with a human body, "that he might conquer death and deliver man"—that "human nature, by God and man in union might come "from the merit of obedience to a reign of immortali-"ty."—He then closes his work with an admonition to the Emperors:—"Let your clemency look ever up to "heaven; from God let it ever wait for help; let it "implore the venerable Deity of Christ; and for the "world's and your own salvation, offer to the God of "salvation, spiritual sacrifices."[s]

188. ATHANASIUS was born, A. D. 298. He became a presbyter of the church of Alexandria in 326, the year after the Council of Nice, when he was only about 28 years of age. He was chosen bishop of that see, upon the demise of Alexander, and, after a life of great labour and persecution, he died in peace, A. D. 373, aged 75 years. The works he hath left behind him contain ample specimens of his great talents, and thorough acquaintance with the Arian controversy. I will produce a few extracts from his writings, because that he was indisputably one of the most able defenders of the divinity of our blessed Lord of the age in which he lived; and though only a presbyter at that time in the church of Alexandria, one of the most active persons in the Council of Nice; and, indeed, the great bulwark in the following years against the Arian heresy; insomuch that it was commonly said, "Athanasius against the world."

"We

[s] Burgh's Sequel, p. 84, 85.

"We confidently assert," says this great man, "and "clearly prove the true religious faith out of the holy "scriptures; and we place it as a candle on a candle-"stick. We alledge that the SON is *naturally* and "*substantially* the SON of the FATHER; of the *same* "*essence* with him; his only-begotten WISDOM; his "true and only WORD: that he was not made, nor "created; but begotten of the substance of the Father; "that therefore *he is truly and properly* GOD; *being of* "*one substance with* GOD *the* FATHER:—that he is the "express and adequate representation of the person of "the FATHER; light off light; the true and genuine "power and image of his Father's substance. He "always was, and is, and never was not: for the WORD "and WISDOM of the FATHER must certainly be "eternal, as well as the FATHER."[6]

189. MACARIUS, the Egyptian, was born in the very beginning of the fourth century. He appears to have been a man of profound piety. Fifty of his homilies, and some other treatises, are still extant. The divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit with the doctrine of the Trinity are frequently made mention of in his writings. I will produce a few instances, and refer to the works themselves for others.

"GOD, who is immense and surpassing all concep-"tion, lessened himself, out of mere goodness, and put "on the members of this body."

190. "The LORD embodies himself that he may be-"come the meat and drink of his people.—He appeared "to every one of the holy fathers as he pleased and "thought best for them; after one manner to Abra-"ham, after another to Isaac, after a third to Jacob; in "a different way to Noah, to Daniel, to David; to "Solomon, to Esaias, and to every one of the Prophets; "after one manner to Elias, after another to Moses."[7]

191. "Con-

[6] Orat. 1. adv. Arian, sect. 9.
[7] Hom. 4. passim.

191. "Consider well thy dignity, how valuable thou "art; that GOD hath made thee above the angels, when "he came also of his own accord in person upon earth, "on thy errand and redemption. God himself and his "angels came to thy salvation. For the King, the "King's Son, held a consult with his Father, and the "WORD was sent, and took flesh upon him, and, con-"cealing his divine nature, laid down his life upon the "cross that he might save like by like. So great is "the love of God towards man! For thy sake he that "cannot die chose to be crucified."[8]

192. "Let us return glory to the FATHER, and to "the SON, and to the HOLY GHOST, for ever and ever. "Amen."[9]

193. HILARY, bishop of Poictiers, wrote twelve books in defence of the Trinity, besides other works, and died in the year 367. His treatise on the Trinity is the largest and most methodical work of any that we have in all antiquity upon this subject. To quote every thing that is important in it is not consistent with the nature and brevity of our plan. I will therefore produce only two or three passages to shew the harmony of his sentiments with those that are gone before.

In the second book he says, "The mystery of the "Trinity is immense and incomprehensible, not to be "expressed by words, nor reached by sense. Being "unperceivable, it blinds our sight; it exceeds the ca-"pacity of our understanding. I understand it not. "Nevertheless I will comfort myself in this, that neither "do the angels know it, nor ages apprehend it, nor "have the apostles enquired of it, nor the SON himself "declared it."

194. In the seventh book he says, "Jesus Christ is "the TRUE GOD, Son of the true God, born before all "ages, and afterwards begotten off Mary."

195. This learned Bishop sent on a certain occasion

a

[8] Hom. 15.
[9] Hom. 7. ad fin. and in many other places.

a morning and evening hymn in an epistle to his daughter Abra, which he conceived in the form of a prayer to Christ, for preservation from the perils of the day and night; and concludes with the common doxology—"Glory to thee, O Lord,—glory to the Only-begotten "—with the Spirit, the Comforter, now, and throughout all ages."

196. AUSONIUS wrote about the year 375. He is full of the doctrine of the Trinity. In a poem entitled Gryphus he says, "The one God is three." In another, stiled Ephemeris, he allots the first hours of the day to prayer. "GOD," says he, "is to be invoked by "me, and the SON of the most high God; their majes"ty in conjunction with the HOLY GHOST being equal." He then proceeds to the prayer itself which he addresses to Christ, whom he calls upon by the titles of, "Saviour, GOD, and Lord, Mind, Glory, Word, Son, "VERY GOD off very God, Light off Light."[1]

197. ST. CYRIL, of Jerusalem, died in the year 386. We have several discourses of his still extant in the form of Catechetical Lectures, wherein he delivers his religious opinions with great freedom. He says, "There is "but one God, the Creator of all things, who is every "where present, who is omniscient, omnipotent, and "unchangeable." He adds, "There is one Lord Jesus "Christ, the only Son of God, GOD begotten of God, "like in all things to him who begat him, who was "from all eternity, who sitteth now at his right hand "and reigneth with him.—He is the WORD, and the "WORD of God, truly united to the human nature—"He assumed real flesh from the virgin—He was truly "man, subject to human infirmities, and to death itself. "—Concerning the HOLY SPIRIT we ought to have the "same notions of him as of the Father and the Son. He "is one, indivisible, ALMIGHTY, and OMNISCIENT. He "ought

[1] See Burgh's Sequel, p. 64.

" ought to be honoured as the Father and the Son, being " one and the same Divinity." [2]

198. Gregory Nazianzen, the best scholar of the most learned age of the ancient church, was born, A. D. 324, and died, A. D. 389. This great man, has spoken at large upon the divinity of Christ, and the doctrine of the Trinity, on several occasions. " We ought to ac- " knowledge one GOD the FATHER," says he, " unbe- " gotten and without beginning, and one SON begotten " of the Father, and one SPIRIT having his existence " from God; different from the Father, indeed, in that " he has no power of fructification, and to the Son, " as being unbegotten; but in other things of the " same nature, the same honour, the same glory, and the " same dignity." [3]

He stiles it in another place, the adorable Trinity, above and before the world; before all time; of the " same majesty, of the same glory, increate, invisible, " above our reach, incomprehensible." [4]

And again he says, " We ought to hold one God, " and to confess three subsistences, or three persons " each with his respective property according to his " subsistence." [5]

These, with many other sentiments to the same purpose, are advanced by this learned and eloquent writer.

199. St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, was born, A. D. 333, and died, A. D. 397. He was an eminent instrument of good to the church in his day, and hath left us a considerable number of treatises on moral and religious subjects. Among others, he has written pretty much at large in defence of the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, with the doctrine of the Sacred Trinity. In this faith, it is well known, and generally allowed, this learned and laborious bishop both lived and died. In his one book on the divinity of Christ, and his three books

[2] Cateches. 11 et 16. p. 98 and 176.
[3] Orat. 26. p. 445.—[4] Orat. 12. p. 204.—[5] Orat. 29. p. 490.

books concerning the Holy Spirit, as well as in his tract on the Apostle's Creed, he has treated pretty much at large on these profound and mysterious subjects. "The "divinity of the Holy Trinity," says he, "is to be believ'd "to be without beginning and without end, although it "is difficult for the mind of man to comprehend it. "Hence it may not improperly be said concerning it, "that we comprehend this only of it, that it cannot be "fully comprehended. There is therefore one God-"head in the three, and there are three in whom is one "Godhead. There is no confusion in the unity, "neither is there any difference in the Trinity."[6]

200. Basil the Great was born, A. D. 328, and died in 378. He was the friend of Gregory Nazianzen, and worthy of the honour. As there is no question made concerning his religious sentiments; I will only produce the following extract from his writings:

"The Spirit is not to be supposed the same with "the Father, from its being said that *God is a spirit.* "Nor yet may the person of the Son and Spirit be "imagined one and the same, from its being said again, "*If any one have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of* "*his: but Christ is in you.* From hence indeed some "have been led to mistake, as if the Spirit and Christ "were the same. But what say we? Namely, that the "property of nature is hereby demonstrated, but not "any confusion of the persons. The Father is he "who hath a perfect essence, and stands in need of no-"thing; the root and fountain of the Son and Holy "Ghost. The Son also is the living Word in the ful-"ness of the Godhead, and the offspring of the Father "without any defect. In like manner the Spirit is full, "not part of another, but considered as perfect and en-"tire in himself. Thus the Son is inseparably united "with the Father, and the Spirit is inseparably united "with the Son, there being nothing to divide, nothing "which might cut off this eternal conjunction. There

[6] Tract. in Symb. Apost. p 89.

" has no age or distance of time passed between them,
" nor can our mind conceive any separation, by which
" the Son should not always coexist with the Father,
" or the Holy Ghost with the Son. When therefore
" we conjoin the Holy Trinity, think not of it as
" three parts of something which only is not in fact
" divided, (for this were an impious imagination) but
" understand the inseparable coexistence of three who
" are perfect and incorporeal. For where there is the
" presence of the Holy Ghost, there also is the presence
" of Christ, and where Christ is, there the Father is
" evidently also. *Know ye not, that your bodies are the*
" *temple of the Holy Ghost?* And if *any one defile the*
" *temple of God, him shall God destroy.* Being sanctified
" therefore by the Holy Ghost, we receive Christ
" dwelling in us in the inner man, and with him the
" Father, making a common abode with those who are
" worthy. The same conjunction likewise is denoted
" by the tradition of baptism, and the confession of
" faith. For if the Spirit be different in nature, how
" came he to be numbered together with them? And
" if in a course of time he was only produced into
" being, and added to the Father and the Son, how
" came he to be ranked with the eternal nature? So
" that they who divide the Spirit from the Father and
" the Son, and number him among the creatures, must
" at once imply the form of baptism to be insignificant,
" and the confession of faith defective. For the Tri-
" nity will be no more a Trinity, if the Spirit be taken
" from it. And yet if any part of the creation be taken
" in, the whole creation may come in (by the same
" reason) and be numbered with the Father and the
" Son. For what (in this case) should hinder us from
" saying, I believe in the Father, and the Son, and in
" the whole creation (or in every creature?) Since if
" it be pious to believe in a part of the creation, much
" more will it become us to take the whole creation
" into our confession. But if you believe in the whole

" creation,

" creation, you then believe not only in angels and mi-
" nistring spirits, but in whatever adverse powers there
" may be, seeing they also are a part of the creation,
" and you are joined to these in the confession of faith.
" Thus does the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost
" lead into wicked and unlawful assertions: and as
" soon as you have spoken what you ought not concern-
" ing the Spirit, the dereliction of the Spirit is manifest
" from thence. For as he that shuts his eyes carries
" darkness with himself; so he who departs from the
" Spirit, being destitute of him that should enlighten
" him, is overwhelmed with spiritual blindness. More-
" over, let tradition have its weight to deter thee from
" separating the Holy Ghost from the Father and the
" Son. This is the doctrine which the Lord hath
" taught, and the Apostles preached; which the Fa-
" thers have preserved, and the Martyrs have confirmed.
" Let it suffice to speak as thou hast learnt, and let me
" hear no more such sophisms as these; Either he is
" unbegotten, or begotten: if unbegotten, he is a father,
" if begotten, he is a son; but if neither of these, he is
" a creature. For my own part, I acknowledge the
" Spirit indeed with the Father, but not to be the Fa-
" ther. And I have received him in conjunction with
" the Son, yet not under the character or name of the
" Son. But I understand his relation to the Father,
" because he proceedeth from the Father; and that to
" the Son, because I hear, *If any one have not the Spirit*
" *of Christ, he is none of his.* Now if he were not the
" proper Spirit of Christ, how should he appropriate
" us to him? I hear him also termed the Spirit of
" truth; and the Lord is the truth. But when I hear
" him called the Spirit of adoption, this calls to mind
" that unity he has by nature with the Father and the
" Son. For how should that which is alien, adopt?
" How should that appropriate, which itself is different
" in kind? Thus therefore am I cautious neither to
" coin new words, nor diminish the majesty of the
" Spirit.

" Spirit. But as for those who dare to call him a " creature, I bewail and lament them, that by slight " sophisms and specious fallacies, they throw themselves headlong into hell. For because our mind " (say they) takes in these three things, and there is " nothing in nature which falls not within this division, " that it is either unbegotten, begotten, or created; " since the Spirit is neither the first, nor the second of " them, το τριτον αρα, it must be the third. This αρα " (or inference) of yours, will render you obnoxious to " an eternal αρα, or curse. Hast thou searched out all " things? Hast thou a compass of thought to bring " every thing under this division? Hast thou left nothing unexamined? Hast thou conceived and shut " up all things in thy understanding? Dost thou know " what is under the earth, or in the deep?" [7]

201. QUINTUS PRUDENTIUS was born in Spain in the year 348. In the fifty seventh year of his age he became seriously religious, and wrote a variety of pieces upon divine subjects. My business is only to produce such passages from his works as shew his opinions on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and such other as are connected with it. In one of his poems then he says, " Be present, O Supreme Father, whom no man hath " seen at any time: O thou Word of the Father, " Christ; and O thou propitious Spirit; O thou one " Power, one Light of this Trinity, eternal God off " God; O God sent forth from both." [8]

" Do thou, O Christ, dispel sleep, burst asunder " the chains of darkness, do away the old offence, and " pour into me a new light." [9]

202. CHRYSOSTOM was one of the most able men among the ancients. He was born, A. D. 354, and died in 407. No doubt can be entertained of his sentiments on the subjects under consideration. He has spoken at large on many occasions. Take the following declaration:

" They

[7] Hom. cont. Sabel. et Arium et Anomæos.
[8] Hymnus ante Somnum, v. 1.—[9] Hymnus ad Galli Cantum ad fin.

"They who embrace the mad notions of Sabellius, "or Arius," says he, "do both of them fall from the "soundness of the faith, for want of observing a due "mean. Both those Heretics, indeed, are called "Christians; but, if you enquire into their doctrines, "you will find the one not much better than the Jews, "and little differing from them, except in name; and "the others very much resembling the heresy of Paul "of Samosata; and both of them exceedingly deviating "from the truth.

"Great, therefore, is the danger in this respect. The "truth lies in a strict and narrow way, between two "steep precipices; and there is reason to fear, lest, "while we fight successfully against the one sort of "heretics, we ourselves be wounded by the other. "For if we assert the unity of the Godhead, immediate-"ly Sabellius draws that expression to his own impious "sense. On the other hand, if we make a distinction, "and say, that the Father is one, the Son another, and "the Holy Ghost another, Arius is ready to wrest that "distinction of persons into a difference of substance. "And it equally concerns us to avoid the impious "confusion of the one, and the mad diversity of the "other, by confessing the Godhead of the Father, Son, "and Holy Ghost, to be all one, and by adding there-"unto a Trinity of persons; for thus shall we fortify "ourselves against both their assaults." [1]

203. AUGUSTINE, bishop of Hippo, was born, A. D. 335, and died in 430. He wrote fifteen books on the doctrine of the Trinity professedly, besides touching upon the subject on many incidental occasions.

"We believe, hold, and faithfully affirm," says he, "that God the Father begot the Word his wisdom, "by which all was made; his only Son; one off one; "coeternal; most good, and most righteous: and that "the Holy Spirit is both off the Father and the Son, "consubstantial,

[1] Chrysostom on the Priesthood, b. 4. c. 4.

" consubstantial, and coeternal with them both. And " this is both a Trinity in respect of persons, and but " one God in the inseparable Divinity; and one om- " nipotent in the inseparable power; yet so, as that " every one of the three be held to be God omnipotent; " and yet altogether are not three omnipotent Gods, " but one God omnipotent. Such is the inseparable " Unity of the three persons, and in this manner must " they be taught." [a]

204. THEODORET was an illustrious writer of the church in the latter end of the fourth century. A single passage of his works, which I find in the third part of bishop Kidder's Demonstration of the Meſſias, will both shew what his opinions were upon this great subject on which we are treating, and confirm many observations that have already been made in some former parts of this work. The quotation is from a sermon of his against the Gentiles. He tells them what Moses had written concerning their false gods, and that he required in his law the worship of the *one* true God. This belief of one God Moses taught in his law, and recommended the worship of him only. Upon this he brings in the Gentiles objecting against the Christians thus: " Perhaps," says he, " you will say, ye Christians " have not kept this law inviolably; for ye preach not " an Unity, but a TRINITY: whereas the Jews, being " brought up in the writings of Moses and the Pro- " phets, worship one only, and reprehend your TRINI- " TY:" To whom he replies:

" O friends, I think you fit to be pardoned, being " ignorant of the Holy Scripture. Yet I cannot but " lament the extreme ignorance of the Jews, because " they being carried from the womb, as the prophet " speaks, and instructed in divine things from their " childhood to old age, are ignorant of the true theolo- " gy. For they continuing a long time in Egypt, and " learning polytheism there, the all-wise God did not " think

[a] Aug. de Civit. Dei, lib. 11. cap. 24.

" think fit plainly to reveal to them the mystery of the " TRINITY, that they might not under that pretext fall " into the polytheism of Egypt. And yet he did not " altogether conceal the doctrine of the TRINITY from " those, who were to come, sowing some of the seeds " of the more perfect theology. And therefore he " gave the law under the representation of ONE, but " did enigmatically insinuate the TRINITY. For these " words, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,* " teach plainly both the UNITY and the TRINITY: " for God being once, the Lord twice named, declare " the Trinity. For adding, *is one,* he delivered a doc- " trine agreeable to the Jews, and expressed the Unity " of the Divine nature: for *one* is the essence, power " and will of the TRINITY. And therefore the com- " pany of the invisible powers singing an hymn to God, " say HOLY *thrice,* and LORD but *once*: by the first " declaring the number of properties; by the other " signifying the common dominion: but hereby the " TRINITY was enigmatically declared. Elsewhere " however holy men taught it more plainly; for the " most divine Moses, writing the cosmogony, and re- " lating the creation of man, affirms that God, the " Creator of all things, said, *Let* US *make man in* OUR " *image, after our likeness:* and he adds, *In the image of* " *God created he him,* that he might shew the difference " of persons. And when God commanded Noah con- " cerning the eating of flesh, and forbad him the eating " of blood, he affirms, that the God of the universe " said, *Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood* " *be shed; for in the image of God made he man.* He " doth not say, In my image, but *in the image of God,* " shewing the distinction of persons. And when those " men met together, who were incensed against their " Maker, to build the tower, that great tower which had " its name from confusion, Moses affirms that God said, " *Go to, let* US *go down, and there confound their language.* " *Let* US *go down and confound,* shews a parity of honour.

" But

" But the words *Go to*, signify the SON and SPIRIT, " who were joined in the creation. For seeing that " when he made man he said, *Let* US *make man in* OUR " *image, after* OUR *likeness*; agreeably hereunto, now he " is dividing one language into many, he takes to him " his fellow-workers, the SON and most HOLY SPIRIT. " In after-time, being about to destroy Sodom and its " neighbouring cities, partners of her profaneness and " wickedness with thunder and fire from heaven, he " mentions to us *two Lords*. Thus Moses writes, *Then* " *the* LORD *rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone* " *and fire* FROM THE LORD *out of heaven*. But lest any " should think, that this prophet alone speaks of the " TRINITY, hear, O my friends, what divine David " says: *By the* WORD *of the* LORD *were the heavens* " *made, and all the host of them by the* SPIRIT *of his* " *mouth*. And again, *The* LORD *said unto my* LORD, " *Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy* " *footstool*. And soon after, the same LORD, the FA- " THER of the LORD, saith, *Thy throne*, O GOD, *is for-* " *ever*; *the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre.* " *Thou lovest righteousness and hateth wickedness*; *there-* " *fore* GOD, *thy* GOD *hath anointed thee with the* OIL OF " GLADNESS *above thy fellows*. The same doctrine is " delivered to us by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and " Daniel, Zechariah, and Micah, and all the company " of prophets."

Dr. Fiddes, whom we have so frequently mentioned in the course of this inquiry, sums up the opinions of the ancient Christian fathers in these words:—

1. " The ancients, in general," says he, " unani- " mously maintained against the Heathens and Heretics, " that there is but one God in the strict sense. And " the same ancients affirmed the Son to be God in the " strict sense; and the Holy Ghost, to be God likewise; " some, in express [3] terms; others, in words equiva- " lent;

[3] Tert. contr. Prax. c. 13. Origen. in Basil. de Sp. S. p. 219. Cyp. Ep. ad Jub. p. 203. Dionys. Alex. Labbe. tom. 1. p. 873. Sabellius's taunting question to the Catholics; Ενα Θεον εχομεν ή

" terms; others, in words equivalent; from whence it " evidently follows, that they looked upon the three " Persons as one God.

2. " The ancients, in general, unanimously asserted a " co-essential and co-eternal Trinity, either directly and " expressly, or implicitly and consequentially; which, in " effect, is to teach, that the Trinity is the one God.

3. " The titles and attributes ascribed to the Son ex- " pressly and frequently (and sometimes, though not so " often, to the Holy Ghost; but always understood and " implied) are demonstrative proofs that all the three " Persons are supposed to be comprehended in the idea " of the one God.

" To mention only such as are applyed to the Son by " the ante-nicene writers: He is stiled God by all in " in general; God and Lord by many of them; Lord " God absolutely by several; particularly by Justin " Martyr and Irenæus, in the application of texts of " the Old Testament: true, or truly God, by most of " them; great God by some, and perfect God: God " by nature; Son by nature; true and proper Son, by " many: God of the Jews, of Abraham, Isaac, and " Jacob, very frequently: sometimes, the only God, " and the living God, and counsellor to the Father: " Creator of men, of angels, and of all things, constant- " ly by all the ancients. As to his attributes, he is re- " presented uncreated, eternal, consubstantial, either " expressly, or in effect, by the concurrent testimony " of the ante-nicene writers. Omnipresent, omniscient, " omnipotent, immutable, incomprehensible, impassi- " ble, &c. by several. In short, every thing is attri- " buted to him that can tend to raise our ideas of his " dignity, and to denote a person strictly and essential- " ly divine.

4. " The

τρεις Θεος. Epiphan. Hær. 62. shews, that the title of God, as applied to the Holy Ghost, was the common language of the church, at that time. And the argument may be carried up much higher from this consideration, that the Praxeans and Noetians made the three persons of the Godhead, one person.

4. "The hymns, worship, and doxologies addressed to the three Persons, as old as Christianity itself, and as unanimously and constantly adhered to, are all so many proofs of the truth of what we assert, that the blessed three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were the God of the primitive Christians." [4]

PART SEVENTH.

SECTION VIII.

Miscellaneous evidence to the PERSON OF CHRIST, and doctrine of the TRINITY, from COUNCILS, HERETICS, and other CIRCUMSTANCES of the first ages.

205. THAT the most respectable of the successors of the Apostles were believers in the divinity of the SON of GOD is sufficiently clear from the history of those times, independent of these numerous testimonies. For, about the middle of the third century, we have already seen, Caius made an appeal to the holy scriptures, and the writings of Justin Martyr, Miltiades, Tatian, Clemens, Irenæus, Melito, and others, which declared Christ to be God and man. He, moreover, appealed to certain psalms and hymns of the brethren, written at the beginning by the faithful, which set forth the praises of Christ, the Word of God, and attributed divinity to him.

In the former part of the fourth century, Athanasius made the same appeal to the Arians:—"We give you "demonstration," says he, "that our doctrine has "been handed down to us from fathers to fathers. "But you, ye revivers of Judaism and disciples of "Caiaphas, what writers can you bring to father your "tenets?

[4] Theol. Specul. vol. 1. p. 392.

" tenets? Not a man can you name, of any repute for " sense or judgment. All to a man are against you." [5]

To the same purpose speaks St. Austin in the beginning of the following age. " All the catholic inter- " preters of the Old and New Testaments," says he, " that I could read, who have wrote before me on the " TRINITY, which is God, intended to teach, con- " formable to scripture, that FATHER, SON, and HOLY " GHOST do, by the inseparable equality of one and " the same substance, make up the *unity divine*." [6]

We have another remarkable instance on record in the time of Theodosius the Great, about, or a little before, the time of Austin's declaration, where a challenge is given by the Orthodox to the Arians to try their principles by an appeal to the catholic writers, who lived before the Council of Nice, and abide by the consequence. The Arians, however, conscious the cause would go against them upon this ground, declined the trial. [7]

206. During the first two or three centuries, when any peculiarly erroneous and obnoxious sentiments arose among the professors of the gospel, they were usually borne down and quashed by the authority of the Apostles, and their immediate successors. Against Cerinthus and Ebion St. John wrote his gospel and first epistle. When, after them, other persons arose and attacked the fundamental principles of the gospel of God, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen, drew the sword of the Spirit, and for a time confounded all their machinations. But when erroneous doctrines began to diffuse themselves far and wide among the brethren, and their patrons became bold and presumptuous in propagating them, it was not thought sufficient for the friends of sound and apostolical doctrine to oppose them in their individual

[5] Athanas. de Decret. Syn. Nic. p. 233.
[6] Aug. de Trinit. l. 1. c. 3.
[7] Socrat. Eccl. Hist. lib. 5. c. 10. and Sozomen lib. 7. c. 12.

capacity merely, but numbers of the clergy and other zealous and orthodox believers were called together from all the neighbouring districts to consider of the dangerous tendency of such doctrines, and to bear a public testimony against them. One of these Councils was at Carthage by Cyprian, who in the year 255 assembled together 87 bishops, besides a great number of inferior clergy, to consider of the propriety or impropriety of rebaptizing of heretics. These 87 bishops, it seems from several circumstances, were all orthodox in their opinions concerning the *divinity* of CHRIST, and the doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY.

207. To these we may add the first Council of Antioch, which was held against Paul of Samosata, who denied the divinity of our blessed Saviour, and asserted that he was nothing more than a mere man. At this Council were 70 bishops, and inferior clergy a considerable number. In their synodical letter to this vain man, they deliver their religious opinions pretty much at large. "That what every one believes may be "more manifest," say they, "we have resolved to "publish and explain in writing the faith which from "the beginning we have received, and which in the "catholic church has been preserved and handed down "to our days from the Apostles, who were themselves "eye witnesses and ministers of the word:—That "there is one GOD, unbegotten, without beginning, "invisible, and unchangeable, of whose glory and "majesty it is not in the power of man to form any "adequate idea. Yet though we have but a very imperfect notion of God, we ought to be content with "what his SON reveals of him, who says, *No one knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.* And as we learn from both "the Old and the New Testament, so we believe and "profess this SON to be the *begotten Son, the only-begotten Son,* the *image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature,* the *Wisdom,* the *Word,* and the

"*Power*

" *Power* of God, existing before all ages, not by fore-
" knowledge, but being in nature and person GOD, *the*
" SON *of* GOD. But whosoever says that the Son of
" God was not God before the creation of the world,
" or who says, that to believe and profess him to be
" God, is professing that there are two Gods: we look
" upon such a one as having forsaken the ancient faith;
" and all the catholic churches are of our opinion.
" For of this Son of God it is written, *Thy throne,*
" *O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteous-*
" *ness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved*
" *righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even*
" *thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness*
" *above thy fellows.*—And all the divinely inspired
" writings declare the SON of GOD to be GOD.—We
" believe this SON, who was always with the FATHER,
" to have fulfilled his Father's will by creating all
" things. For *he spake and they were made, he com-*
" *manded and they were created.* For he who com-
" mands any thing gives his commands to another
" person; which other person we are persuaded is no
" other than GOD, *the only-begotten* SON *of* GOD, to
" whom he said: *Let us make man according to our*
" *image and likeness.*" [8]

208. The Council of Nice assembled in the year of our Lord 325, to settle the differences which had arisen in the church concerning the person of Christ. At this celebrated synod were no less than 318 bishops from all parts of the Christian world, and of inferior clergy a vast concourse. After much debating upon the subject, a creed was drawn up and signed by all the bishops present, except two. In this creed, it is well known, the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, were established. " I believe," say they, " in one Lord Jesus Christ,
" the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Fa-
" ther before all worlds, God off God, Light off
" Light, very God off very God, begotten, not made,
" being

[8] Labbeus's Coun. vol. 1. p. 843.

" being of one substance with the Father, by whom " all things were made: who for us men, and for our " salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate " by the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary, and was " made man, and was crucified also for us under " Pontius Pilate.—I believe in the Holy GHOST, the " Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the " Father and the Son; who with the Father and the " Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake " by the Prophets."—This is the part of the creed which respects the subjects we are now upon. And it is remarkable, that even the two bishops who refused to sign it, as firmly believed the pre-existence of Christ, and most of the other circumstances which that creed contained, as those who did sign it, and speak of Christ in terms which signify every thing but absolute divinity. " We believe," say they, " in one God, the " Father Almighty, and in our Lord Jesus Christ his " Son, begotten of him before all ages, God the " Word, by whom all things were made in heaven and " in earth, who descended and was incarnate, suffered, " arose, and ascended into heaven." [9] —

After Arius and his friends had delivered in his creed to the emperor Constantine, they further declare, " This faith we have received from the holy gospels, " in which the Lord saith to his disciples, *Go and teach* " *all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father,* " *and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* If we do not " believe these things, and truly acknowledge the " Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as the whole " catholic church, and the scriptures teach, to which " we yield an assent in all things, God is our judge " both now and at the day of judgment." [1]

209. After

[9] Ecc. Hist. of Socrates, b. 1. ch. 8.

[1] Ibid. ch. 26.

—Acesius, the Novatian bishop of Constantinople, being asked by the emperor Constantine the Great, what he thought of the Nicene Council, answered, " There is nothing new in it. It " is what I have received even from the beginning, and from the " Apostolical times." Apud. Socrat. l. 1. cap. 10.

209. After the Council of Nice in 325, there was another held at Constantinople in 381, consisting of 150 bishops. This was against Macedonius, who denied

"There is so much greater veneration due to the determination "of that Council (than to any single Father or modern Writer) "since the Nicene fathers were by far more competent judges of "the doctrine debated by them than we of these latter ages, not "only as they were very near to the times of the old apostolical "men, but also as they had the unspeakable advantage of con- "sulting the intermediate writers on that subject, and, consequently, "of balancing aright the arguments both of orthodox and heretical "authors—which were extant in their age, but are long since en- "tirely perished, or such imperfect fragments left us of them, "that no certain judgment can be formed of the original works. "So that if we could suppose there were any thing dubious in the "Christian faith, with relation to the person of our Lord, how is "it possible it could be fixed and determined more authentically, "than by the bishops of the Christian Church, assembled upon "that very occasion from all parts of the world, at no great distance "from the Apostles themselves? This early and (almost) unani- "mous assembly must, therefore, be considered by all impartial "men as the best interpreters of the apostolical writings; and as "such, and upon so solemn an occasion, having established the con- "substantial doctrine, they have established it for the Christian "church forever.—All those circumstances concurred in the Fa- "thers of the Nicene Council that can give weight and authority "to the testimonies of mere uninspired men; consequently we "have a moral certainty of the truth of that faith that was estab- "lished by the testimonies of those Fathers as interpreters of "divine revelation. As if so solemn a decision made by the best "judges, so near to the apostolical age, had been designed by the "good providence of God, to be left as a standing monument to "the church, on purpose to prevent all disputes of this nature in "future ages." Allix's Reflections on the Conduct of Mr. Whis- ton, p. 10.

Both Eusebius and Constantine himself bear witness to the character and equitable proceedings of this celebrated Council. "It "was composed," says Eusebius, "of the principal learned men of "several nations, some famous for wisdom of speech, some for "gravity of life, and some for both. Some venerable for their "age and experience, others for their ingenuity and wit."

Constantine in his letter to the church of Alexandria signifies, that he with the Council endeavoured that the truth in controversy might be thoroughly tried out; and that all things were narrowly sifted, by the testimony of the holy scriptures searched into for that purpose.—See the whole Epistle in Socrat. Eccl. Hist. book 1. chap. 9.

nied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, as Arius had denied that of the Son. This Council confirmed what had been approved at Nice, and added this clause concerning the Spirit:

"And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of "life, who proceedeth from the Father, who together "with the Father and the Son is worshipped and "glorified; who spake by the prophets."

210. After this again there was another general Council of 200 bishops at Ephesus against Nestorius in the year 431, which confirmed the Nicene creed, and made some small additions concerning the incarnation of the Son of God.

211. And again in the year 451 there was a fourth general Council at Calcedon against Eutyches consisting of 630 bishops, in which the creeds of the former Councils were approved and enlarged according to the circumstances of the times.

212. That the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit were understood to be doctrines of Christianity from the beginning, is further confirmed from the treatment the several persons met with whom we usually call heretics. If we consider Simon Magus in this light, the scripture informs us what reception he met with from St. Peter. And afterwards, when he had been rejected by the Apostle, his conduct in going about the world deceiving the nations, and proclaiming himself to be Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, seems strongly to imply, that the doctrines concerning these three divine Persons were then taught among Christians.

213. Cerinthus, who was the next we have any account of, that denied the divinity of the Saviour, was opposed by St. John both in his Gospel and first Epistle.

214. Ebion was a disciple of Cerinthus, and espoused the same errors, which were near the principles of our modern Socinians. He lived about the year of our Lord 72. His opinions were opposed by St. John,

John, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and others.

215. About the year 195 again, Theodotus of Byzantium, revived the same heresy, and was opposed by Caius, Victor, Hippolitus, and the churches of that age.

216. Artemon likewise, about the year 205, was a disciple of Theodotus, and a promoter of his erroneous opinions. He too was resisted by the same Caius, and those who had opposed Theodotus his master.

217. Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, espoused some erroneous sentiments concerning the person of Christ, A. D. 242. He was called to an account by the churches of those days, was convinced of his error by the great Origen, and restored again to communion.

218. Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, A. D. 265, gave the churches fresh occasion for exerting their zeal in behalf of our Lord's divinity. Being called upon to answer to the charge of heresy, he pretended to renounce his errors, and was reconciled. Soon after, however, he relapsed into the same heresy, and in the year 270, was again accused, convicted, and deposed.

219. Arius advanced an error concerning the person of Christ, A. D. 317, somewhat different from the former. This became the cause of assembling the famous Council of Nice, where he was condemned by near 318 bishops, two or three only of the number adhering to his opinion.

This short view of the several heretics, who arose in these early ages of the church, shew us in a very strong light, that the real and proper divinity of Christ was the received doctrine of the general body of believers from the very days of the Apostles, independent of every other evidence.

220. As a further proof of this, it may be urged, that when the Praxeans, Noetians, and Sabellians, charged the Orthodox with worshipping three Gods, they never defended themselves by insisting that the

Father only was God, and the Son and Spirit creatures; but they studiously and conscientiously avoided every thing of the kind, and insisted, that though both Father, Son, and Spirit, were God, yet that there was but one living and true God. They were three persons, and but one God. This single circumstance shews plainly, that the doctrine of the Trinity, in the common acceptation of that term, was then the generally received doctrine of the church.

221. I think too we may justly argue from the opinions of the Docetæ, which prevailed in the time of St. John, that Christ was looked upon as much more than human. Indeed, these heretics, who were opposed both by St. John and Ignatius, had such an exalted opinion of the Redeemer, that they supposed he had nothing human about him, and that all his sufferings were in appearance only.

222. Another circumstance, which may be mentioned, seems to me of some weight in this question, and that is, when the Novatians, Donatists, and Nestorians, at different periods, broke off from the Catholics, they retained the doctrine of the Trinity, as then generally understood, and only varied from the great body of believers in some inferior circumstances: In like manner as when the Protestants broke off from the church of Rome in these latter ages, they retained all the fundamentals of the gospel professed by that church, and only rejected the abuses which had crept in during the preceding ages. The persons who lived in the first centuries had considerably the advantage of us for coming to the knowledge of the original doctrines of Christianity, because they had before them the writings of abundance of authors which have long since perished in the wreck of time.

RECAPITULATION

OF THE

WHOLE EVIDENCE.

WE have now gone through every part of our enquiry in the manner we had proposed. We have traced the character of our blessed Saviour from the beginning of the world to the close of the divine canon. We have seen what were the expectations of mankind before he came; what were his own pretensions; what the declarations of both friends and enemies while he was here upon earth; and what the representations of his disciples have been since he left our world, when they were under the fullest degree of spiritual illumination. And the sum of all, in one view, is this:

PART FIRST.

Christ is

1. the seed of the woman.
2. Enoch's Lord, coming to judge the wicked.
3. Abraham's promised seed.
4. Isaac's promised seed.
5. Jacob's promised seed.
6.* Jacob's redeeming angel.
7. Jacob's gathering Shiloh.
8. Jacob's expected salvation.
9.* the true Melchizedek.
10. the Jehovah tempted by the Israelites.
11. the true brazen serpent.
12. Balaam's star and sceptre.
13. Job's living redeemer.
14. Moses's prophet like unto himself.
15. Hannah's anointed king.
16.* David's anointed king, and son of God.
17. David's son of man.
18. David's holy one.
19. David's Jehovah.
20. David's afflicted one.
21. David's shepherd.
22. David's Lord of hosts, and king of glory.

23.*	Christ is	David's	atoning sacrifice.
24.			light and truth.
25.*			God, whose throne is established in righteousness.
26.			ascending king, God, and Lord.
27.			rock.
28.*			Lord God, who ascended on high.
29.			afflicted servant.
30.*			righteous and peaceful king.
31.			most high God.
32.			man of God's right hand, and son of man.
33.			everlasting seed.
34.*			Lord of the whole earth, whom the angels adore.
35.*			everlasting and unchangeable God.
36.*			God, who was tempted in the wilderness.
37.*			Lord, who sitteth at God's right hand.
38.*			Lord, who existed before the morning star.
39.			just one, who ruleth over men.
40.*		Solomon's	wisdom, that existed from eternity.
41.*			son of the Creator.
42.			son of the Father.
43.			rose of Sharon, lily of the valleys, and chief among ten thousand.
44.		Amos's	God, who overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.
45.			Lord God of hosts.
46.*		Hosea's	Lord their God.
47.			David, king of Israel.
48.			son of God.
49.*			God, Lord God of hosts, and Jehovah.
50.		Isaiah's	more than mere man.
51.*			Emanuel.
52.*			Lord of hosts himself.
53.*			wonderful, counsellor, mighty God, everlasting father, prince of peace.
54.*			rod, branch, and root of Jesse.
55.			crown of glory and diadem of beauty.
56.			precious corner stone, and sure foundation.
57.*			God coming with vengeance & recompense.
58.*			Jehovah our God.
59.*			Lord God, who should come.
60.*			Lord God, who should feed his flock as a shepherd.
61.*			Lord, King of Israel, Lord of hosts, first and last.
62.			God of Israel, the Saviour, who hideth himself.
63.*			God alone, unto whom the nations are commanded to look, bow, and be saved.
64.*			Lord, in whom we have righteousness and

		Isaiah's	strength, and in whom all the seed of Israel shall be justified and shall glory.
65.*			God that reigneth.
66.*			servant of God, and man of sorrows, who should atone for the sins of mankind.
67.			Lord of hosts, and husband of his church.
68.			witness, leader, & commander to the people.
69.*			mighty and righteous conqueror of Edom and Bozrah.
70.			Lord, who was found of them that sought him not.
71.*		Micah's	ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from everlasting.
72.*		Jeremiah's	Being, in whom man should trust.
73.*			righteous branch, whose name is Jehovah our righteousness.
74.			branch of righteousness, whose name is Jehovah our righteousness.
75.		Ezekiel's	servant David, shepherd of the Lord's flock, and plant of renown.
76.		Daniel's	stone, cut out of the mountain without hands.
77.*	Christ is		son of man, invested with universal dominion.
78.			Lord, in whose name he prays to the Lord God.
79.*			Messiah the prince, who was to be cut off as an atoning sacrifice.
80.		Haggai's	desire of all nations.
81.*		Zecha:	Jehovah, who should dwell in the midst of his people.
82.			branch, and servant of the Lord.
83.			branch, who should build the temple of the Lord, who should be both a king and a priest, between whom and the Lord of hosts should be the council of peace.
84.			humble, just, and saving king.
85.			Lord, in whose name the people should walk up and down.
86.*			Jehovah who was valued at thirty pieces of silver.
87.			Jehovah who should be pierced.
88.*			shepherd and fellow of the Lord of hosts.
89.*			Lord God who shall come with all his saints.
90.*		Malachi's	messenger of the covenant, and Lord who should come to his temple.
91.			sun of righteousness.

Besides all these declarations of the Old Testament concerning the Son of God, we have an account in the same sacred writings of various appearances and manifestations of the same adorable person.

92.		at the creation of the world.
93.		to our first parents in Eden.
94.		at the confusion of tongues.
95.		to Abram in a vision.
96.*		to Hagar in the wilderness.
97.*		to Abraham in person in the plains of Sodom.
98.		to Abimelech king of Gerar.
99.		to Abraham again concerning Ishmael.
100.*		to Abraham on the sacrifice of Isaac.
101.		to Jacob in his journey to Padan-aram.
102.*		to Jacob at Mahanaim.
103.*		to Moses in the burning bush.
104.*	Messiah appeared	to destroy the Egyptians.
105.		to the Israelites on mount Sinai.
106.*		to the Israelites in the wilderness.
107.		to Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu.
108.		to Balaam in the way.
109.*		to Joshua as captain of the Lord's host.
110.*		to the Israelites at Bochim.
111.*		to Gideon at Ophrah.
112.*		to Manoah and his wife.
113.		to Isaiah under the character of the Name of the Lord.
114.		to Daniel as king of the whole earth.
115.		to Zechariah as man-angel.
116.		to Zechariah as Angel-Jehovah.
117.		to Isaiah in the temple. And
118.		to Habakkuk as the avenger of his people.

This is the amount of the evidence to the person and character of Christ from the Old Testament.

PART SECOND.

The evidence from the New Testament is as follows:

119*—120.* Gabriel, the arch-angel, declared, even before our Saviour was conceived in the womb, that he was the LORD GOD of Israel, *born* of a *Virgin*, *begotten* of the *Holy Ghost*, called the *Son* of the *Highest*, the *Son* of *God*, and an *everlasting King*.

121.* Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist, being *filled* with the *Holy Ghost*, declared Jesus Christ to be *her* LORD, before he was born into the world.

122.* Zacharias, *filled* with the *Holy Ghost* also, declared that his son

son John should be the *prophet* of the *Highest*, and go before the face of the *Lord* to prepare his way; and that Christ should be the *day-spring* from on high.

123.* The Angel, after his birth, declared Jesus to be CHRIST THE LORD.

124. Good old Simeon, under divine influence, with the child Jesus in his arms, proclaimed him to be *the Salvation* and *Light* of the *world*.

125.* St. Matthew represents him as *begotten* by the HOLY GHOST, and born of the *virgin* Mary, as the *Saviour* of the world, and GOD *in human nature*.

126*—130.* John the Baptist, when grown to years of maturity, bore a more ample testimony to his great Lord and Master than most or all of those who had gone before him. He positively declares, that *Jesus existed before he himself did*:

That *Jesus Christ* was both *mightier and more worthy* than *himself*:

That *he* had *the power* of *bestowing* the *Holy Ghost* upon whomsoever he pleased:

That the souls of men were all *in his hand to reward or punish*:

That he is the *only-begotten* SON of GOD:

That though he was upon earth in his human nature, yet he still continued, in a way not to be explained by us, *in the bosom of his heavenly Father*:

That he was the LORD spoken of by Isaiah:

That he was the great propitiation, ransom, and atonement for the sins of the world, represented by the paschal LAMB, and the morning and evening sacrifice under the Mosaical dispensation:

That the SPIRIT of GOD descended from heaven and abode upon him:

That he had the power of bestowing the HOLY SPIRIT upon his followers:

That he was the SON of GOD:

That he was the bridegroom of the church, and descended from heaven, where he had seen and heard the will of God, which he declared to the world:

That the Holy Spirit was given unto him without any measure or restriction:

That the Father hath a peculiar love to his Son, and hath given all things into his hands:

That whosoever believeth on the Son of God shall be everlastingly saved:

That whosoever continueth in disobedience and unbelief to the end of his days shall be eternally condemned, and the wrath of God abideth upon him, even now in the present state.

This

This is the information John the Baptist gives us concerning the person, character, and offices of the Son of God and Saviour of men.

131.* Nathaniel calls Christ the SON of GOD, and the KING of Israel.

132. Martha tells us he was the CHRIST, and the SON of GOD, who should come into the world.

133—134. Peter, and all the Apostles, of whom he was the mouth, declared most assuredly, that Jesus was the CHRIST, the SON of the living GOD, and of infinite knowledge and understanding.

135. The Magi of the East offered to the infant Saviour gifts expressive of their belief of his DIVINITY.

136.* All the Apostles confessed their belief in the *omniscience* of Jesus.

137. A whole ship's crew *worshipped* Jesus, and acknowledged that he was the SON of GOD.

138. Pilate would take no denial, but declared to all the world, that Jesus of Nazareth was the KING of the Jews.

139. The Roman Centurion, struck with astonishment at the wonders, which accompanied the crucifixion, cried out, *Truly this was the* SON *of* GOD.

140—142. The very Devils confessed Jesus to be the SON of GOD, and well knew that he was the Christ.

143—144. God himself hath repeatedly declared, that Jesus is his *beloved* SON, *in whom he was well-pleased*, and hath commanded all mankind to hear and obey his high behests.

145. The unbelieving Thomas, without the smallest degree of disapprobation from his great Master, addressed him as his LORD and his GOD.

146—147. Christ avowed himself the promised MESSIAH.

148*—160.* Jesus Christ asserted his own pre-existence in the clearest and most satisfactory manner upon many occasions.

161. He declares that there is something *inexplicably mysterious* in his own nature.

162. He asserts his own *infinitude* of knowledge, and *equality* to his Father.

163. He declares his own *proper filiation*.

164. He assures us he is the LORD *of the sabbath day*.

165. He asserts his own *omnipresence* and *omniscience*.

166. He proclaims himself the ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON of GOD.

167*—183. Christ speaks of himself upon many occasions in the most easy and familiar manner as the SON of GOD, intimating thereby, that GOD is his *true* and *proper* parent.

184—185. Declares he had actual and *almighty existence* at the very time his body was laying lifeless in the grave.

186. Assumes the power of giving natural and eternal life to all who believe in his name.

187. Proclaims himself the LORD and MASTER, in an *incommunicable* sense, of all his followers.

188. Declares that his intention in coming into the world was to make *atonement* for sin.

189. Promises *to dwell* in his people *in common with* his FATHER.

190. Avows himself to be the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*, and the only mediator between God and man—declares that he who had seen *him* had seen the FATHER—that *he* was in the FATHER and the FATHER in *him*—that whatsoever any of his disciples should ask the Father in his name *he* would give it them—that *he* and his FATHER would dwell in the hearts of Christians—that *he* would send the HOLY SPIRIT from the FATHER—that the business of the SPIRIT should be to testify of JESUS in the hearts of his people and glorify *him*—that *all things* which belong to the FATHER belong also to *him*.

191.* Declares *himself* to be the *giver* of eternal life—that *he* and his FATHER are *one*—that he was the *Son* of GOD—that the FATHER dwelt in *him* and *he* in the FATHER—and that he was *equal* with GOD.

192.* Assumes to himself the power of working on the sabbath in common with his FATHER—makes himself *equal* with GOD—asserts his *own* power to be like to that of his FATHER—declares himself the *judge* of the world——and claims the *same honour* to himself that is given to his *Father*.

193. The *manner* in which Christ performed several of his miraculous works was in the highest style of DEITY, and inconsistent with every idea of simple humanity.

194—197. Christ laid down his life in attestation of his being the *true* and *proper* SON of GOD.

198. Declares *himself* possessed of *all* power both in heaven and in earth.

199. Requires *all the world* to be baptized in his name.

200. Asserts his own *omnipresence*.

201—205. Declares himself the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *beginning* and the *ending*, the *Almighty*, who exists from everlasting to everlasting, and *searcheth* the *hearts* and *trieth* the *reins* of *all* the children of men.

After this we have the opinions of the apostles and disciples of our Lord when he had withdrawn from our world.

206—208. St. Stephen declares our Saviour to be the JUST ONE—

commits his departing spirit into his hands—and dies crying to him for mercy on his murderers.

209.* Peter, and all the Apostles, being assembled together in one place, *invoked the Lord Jesus* to direct the lot for the choice of another witness in the room of Judas.

210. The same Peter assures us, it was not possible that *Christ* should be kept in the grave by the power of death.

211.* He speaks of Christ in such a connexion with the FATHER and HOLY GHOST as seems to imply something more than human.

212—215. He calls him the HOLY ONE, the JUST, the PRINCE OF LIFE, and the LORD OF ALL.

216—222.* He says that *Christ existed* in the days of *Noah*—— that all the angelic world are now made subject to him—calls him our GOD and SAVIOUR—declares that heaven is his everlasting kingdom—that he *bought* us from wrath—that to deny him who thus *bought* us is a damnable heresy—he commands us to grow in the knowledge of *him*—and ascribes *glory to him* forever.

223. The Eunuch of Ethiopia declared Jesus to be the SON OF GOD.

224. St. James stiles him LORD OF GLORY.

225—226. It is thought by some that St. Jude calls Jesus Christ the only wise God, and the only Lord God.

227.* The manifestation of our Saviour to Saul in his way to Damascus seems to have been a repetition of the ancient appearances to Adam, Abraham, Moses and others under the Patriarchal and Mosaical dispensations.

228.* St. Paul, speaking to the Elders of the church of Ephesus, calls our Saviour GOD.

229*—264.* From a considerable variety of precepts, declarations, and examples, it appears that our blessed *Saviour is an object of religious adoration*, and, of consequence, that he is, possessed of a nature *properly Divine*.

265.* St. Paul speaks of the two natures of Christ, the human and divine.

266*—267. He contrasts the human and divine natures, and expressly calls Christ, *God over all blessed forever*.

268*—272.* He speaks of it as an instance of great condescension in God to spare his *Own Son* to die for mankind—assures us he is the LORD of glory—the LORD from heaven—— and denounces a most awful curse upon every man who loves not the Lord Jesus Christ.

273*—275.* He declares that GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto himself—that he was made a *sin-offering* for his people that they might be saved—that he lived in a state of glory before he assumed human nature—and that he emptied himself of that glory and became a poor man, to restore us to a state of felicity.

276*—279.* He assures us that Christ was made of a woman for the

the salvation of mankind—that his love in this undertaking was inexpressibly great—that he was in the *form* of God and thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God before he came into the world—and that he is now in his glorified human body able to subdue all things unto himself.

280*—284.* He declares that *Christ* is the *creator* and *upholder* of the whole *universe of things*—that all the wisdom and knowledge of the Godhead belong to him—and that he was GOD *manifested* in the *flesh*.

285*—286.* He calls Christ the Lord the righteous judge—and the great God.

287*—295.* The same Apostle tells us that Christ is the SON OF GOD—the heir of all things—the *constitutor* of the ages—the *brightness* of the Father's glory—the *express image* of his person—the *sustainer* of the universe—the universal atonement—and the unchanging and unchangeable *Creator* of the world.

296*—300.* We are assured by the same authority, that Christ was superior to angels, and pre-existed his human birth—that he was the *builder* and *founder* of the Jewish church—and that he is *omniscient*—existed at the giving of the Law on mount Sinai——and is *unchangeable* in his nature.

301*—304.* St. John declares that the WORD was in the beginning with God, and was God—that he was the *Creator* of the universe, and the illuminator of the moral world—that he knew the secrets of all hearts—that he was pre-existent and omnipotent—and that he was the Son of God the Father, and the Saviour of all who believe in his name.

305*—311.* The same Apostle maintains both his humanity and divinity—assures us he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world—that he laid down his life for us—that that he took upon him human nature, and in that nature became the Saviour of the world—that he is one with the Father and the Holy Ghost—and is the TRUE GOD and *eternal life*.

312*—328.* This Apostle closes the scriptural canon with a variety of expressions descriptive of the personal dignity and glory of Jesus. He calls him the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *first* and the *last*, the *Almighty*, the prince of the kings of the earth—he tells us that he hath the keys of hell and of death, and hath life eternal to bestow—he assures us that Christ searcheth the reins and heart, and inhabiteth the praises of the whole angelic world—he calls him the WORD of God, faithful and true, King of kings and Lord of lords, the temple and the light of heaven—he says the throne of the Lamb is in heaven, and is the same as the throne of his Father—that he is the Alpha and Omega,

the

the beginning and the end, the first and the last, the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star—the LORD GOD, and the GREAT GOD—and that the Angels are employed as his servants and ministers.

After this, we proceeded, in the

THIRD PART,

to examine the scripture-evidence for the doctrine of the HOLY GHOST, and we found,

1. That the DIVINE SPIRIT assisted at the creation of the world. Numbers 329,* 332,* 333,* 391, 582.

2. The HOLY SPIRIT is omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal. Nos. 347,* 357, 482, 514, 515,* 585.

3. To lie unto him is the same as lying unto God. Nos. 449,* 450.

4. Blasphemy against him is unpardonable. Nos. 399, 400, 421.

5. He is joined with the FATHER, and the SON, in baptism, benediction, operation, and testimony. Nos. 402, 507,* 537, 553, 588,* 601.

6. He was the agent in forming the body of Christ. Nos. 392, 393, 409.

7. He is the power of the Highest. Nos. 409.

8. He was the conductor of Christ in all the actions of his life, while here upon earth. Nos. 362, 396, 397, 405, 417, 418, 419, 426, 465, 490.

9. He striveth with the hearts of men. Nos. 330, 353, 454, 587.

10. Men's bodies, by being the temples of the SPIRIT, are the temples of GOD. Nos. 519,* 521, 535.

11. The HOLY GHOST dwells in the minds of all good men. Nos. 331, 381, 382, 383, 522, 528, 533, 534, 536, 542, 554,* 568, 569, 579, 583, 595, 596, 597, 599.

12. He qualified the Apostles of Christ for the work to which they were called. Nos. 438, 439, 440, 442, 445, 446, 447, 448, 456, 457, 458, 460, 466, 470, 471, 472, 477, 478, 479, 483, 484, 538, 539, 540, 541.

13. He is the author, and worker of miracles. Nos. 398, 511, 575, 600.

14. He raised Christ from the dead, and shall also raise the bodies of believers from the grave at the last day. Nos. 498, 592.

15. He is the author of all prophetic knowledge. Nos. 335, 336, 338, 340, 342, 348, 351, 384, 385, 386, 401, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 474, 518, 594, 611.

16. He is the inspirer of ingenious arts and inventions. Nos. 334, 349.*

17. He is the reviver of the powers of nature, and the inspirer of courage

courage and fortitude. Nos. 337, 339, 341, 345, 369, 374, 379, 388, 596.

18. He it was who led the Israelites, and gave them rest, after their forty years travel in the wilderness. Nos. 363,* 365.*

19. He is the author of all moral and religious excellence, grace, purity, and holiness. Nos. 343, 344, 346, 350, 352, 354, 355, 356, 358, 359, 361, 364, 366, 378, 380, 387, 389, 390, 394, 403, 406, 407, 408, 416, 420, 423, 426, 427, 428, 430, 435, 443, 444, 452, 453, 455, 462, 467, 468, 473, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 497, 499, 500, 501, 503, 508, 509, 510, 512, 516, 520, 529, 530, 531, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 559, 560, 561, 563, 564, 566, 567, 570, 577, 578, 580, 586, 591, 602, 603, 605, 607, 610, 612.

20. He is the author of all religious gifts among men. Nos. 524, 525,* 526, 527, 581, 604, 608.

21. This Spirit is but one. Nos. 557, 558.

22. He hath a real *personal* existence. Nos. 360,* 367,* 368,* 370,* 371,* 372,* 373,* 375,* 376,* 377,* 395,* 404, 415, 422, 424,* 425, 431,* 432,* 433,* 434,* 435,* 437, 441, 450, 459,* 460,* 463,* 464,* 469,* 475,* 476,* 480,* 481,* 485,* 486,* 487, 488,* 489,* 502,* 505,* 506, 517, 525, 562, 576,* 582, 583,* 590, 606, 609, 613.

23. He reveals Christ to the minds of men. Nos. 413, 523, 555.

24. He is the SPIRIT of GOD. Nos. 377, 395, 593, 598.

25. He is also the SPIRIT of CHRIST. Nos. 496, 542, 564, 589.

26. He proceedeth from the FATHER and the SON. Nos. 423, 432, 433, 434, 435, 445.

27. He is distinguished by the titles LORD and GOD. Nos. 449, 489, 507, 513, 519, 521, 532, 535, 566, 572, 573, 574, 582, 594.

28. The HOLY SPIRIT is an object of *religious adoration*. Nos. 402, 537, 566, 572, 573, 574, 604.

Having thus ascertained the scriptural doctrine concerning the SON, and HOLY SPIRIT, we proceeded in the

FOURTH PART,

to examine the Word of God concerning the Sacred TRINITY, and it appears that the scriptural view of that mysterious *Triplicity* stands thus:

1. The word *Elohim*, which the Hebrew scriptures most commonly use for the name of the SUPREME BEING, is considered by many respectable scholars, both ancient and modern, both Jewish and Christian, as conveying the idea of *plurality*. This appears from Nos. 614, 617, 618, 620, 621, 622, 623, 626, 628, 629, 632, 633, 635, 639, 641, 642.

2. Other *plural* nouns are used for the name of GOD in a manner similar to that in which *Elohim* is used. Nos. 634, 640, 645, 647, 648, 650, 651, 663, 671, 672, 673, 674, 678, 682.

3. GOD, moreover, sometimes speaks of himself in the *plural* number, in such a connection as enforces the *plural* meaning of the word *Elohim*. Nos. 615, 616, 618.

4. In some passages of holy scripture *two* or *three* words are used by which to express the several persons in the GODHEAD. Nos. 619, 624, 625, 630, 631, 638, 643, 644, 649, 653, 655, 656, 658, 659, 661, 669, 670, 675, 677, 681.

5. There are other places, where a *triple* repetition of the same word seems to intimate the *threefold* distinction in the DEITY. Nos. 627, 652, 657, 676, 730, 789.

6. The *three* persons of the GODHEAD are very frequently mentioned together in the same text or context. Nos. 636, 637, 646, 654, 660, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 679, 680,——683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792.

7. Each of the *three* persons in the DIVINE NATURE is an object of *prayer*, and the hopes of Christians. Nos. 688, 732, 751, 765, 766, 767, 782.

After having surveyed the Sacred Writings, we examined, in the

FIFTH PART,

the opinions that were entertained by the *ancient Jews* upon these deep things of God; and found the substance of what they expected in their MESSIAH stand thus:—

1. Tobit seems to intimate a *plurality* in the Godhead.

2. The book of Judith ascribes the creation of the world to the *Spirit* of God, or rather, to the *Son* and *Spirit* of God.

3. Under the image of *Truth* may, possibly, be comprehended the eternity and omnipotence of Messiah.

4. Esdras speaks of him as the *Son of God*, and the *Name of the Lord*.

5. The same Esdras calls him by the name *Jesus Christ*, *Son* of *God*, and says that he should die.

6. He likewise speaks of the HOLY GHOST as the inspirer of knowledge.

7. The wise Son of Sirach seems to think it was the LOGOS who conversed with Moses on mount Sinai.

8. The

8. The *Angel* that appeared to Joshua is called by him, THE LORD, and THE MIGHTY ONE.

9. Elias seems to have wrought his miracles by the power of the WORD of the Lord most high.

10. He says he called upon the LORD, the FATHER of HIS LORD.

11. MESSIAH appeared in battle in behalf of his chosen people.

12. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon calls the *third* person in the Divine Nature, WISDOM, and the HOLY SPIRIT *of discipline*, and declares that HE filleth the world.

13. He describeth the excellence of MESSIAH under the character of WISDOM, and attributes unto it such perfections as are inseparable from Divinity.

14. He prayeth for WISDOM, declaring that she sitteth by the throne of God.

15. He assureth us that the SPIRIT of GOD is incorruptible, and *pervadeth all nature*.

16. He says it is the WORD of the LORD which healeth all things.

17. He calls the WORD of GOD, *Almighty*; says he is seated by the throne of God; and it was *he* who *destroyed* the *Egyptians*.

18. Baruch declareth, GOD shewed himself upon earth, and conversed with men.

The learned PHILO enlarges much upon the nature of the Divine Being. He says,

19. The Divine LOGOS is the power which made the world.

20. The Divine LOGOS is the *image* of God: the HOLY SPIRIT is the *image* of the LOGOS, and the *universal light* from whence all splendor springs.

21. Man is made in the *image* of the Divine LOGOS.

22. GOD made the world by his LOGOS.

23. The Divine LOGOS is *omniscient* and *omnipotent*.

24. With GOD are two SUPREME POWERS, the *first* MADE, the *second* GOVERNS the universe.

25. The Divine LOGOS is the *governour* of the universe.

26. GOD made the world by the LOGOS.

27. The *two* POWERS of God are unlimited and incomprehensible.

28. The *Supreme* GOD is superior to his *two* POWERS, is to be seen without them, and appears in them.

29. GOD governs the universe by his righteous LOGOS, who is his *first-born* SON.

30. The SON of GOD is an *intellectual* Being.

31. The FATHER of *existence* produced the LOGOS as his eldest SON, whom he has named his FIRST-BEGOTTEN.

32. The *first-born* LOGOS of GOD is the most ancient *angel*, the *archangel* with many names, the *beginning*, the *name of God*, the *man* according to *his image*, the *seeing Israel*, the most *ancient* WORD, and the *eternal* IMAGE *of God*.

33. The FATHER of the *universe* is in the *middle* of his *two* POWERS,

POWERS, and represents to the mind the appearances, sometimes of *one*, sometimes of *three*.

34. The *two cherubim* on the mercy-seat were symbols of the *two Powers* of GOD.

35. The *most ancient* WORD is the PRINCE of *angels*, and the MEDIATOR *between God and man*.

36. The holy LOGOS instructs and influences the minds of men, *spoke to Adam* in the garden of Eden, and *to Moses from the burning bush*.

37. The Divine LOGOS, the *first-begotten* SON *of God*, is HIGH-PRIEST of the world, which is the temple of the Almighty.

38. The supplications of the Jewish high-priest were made efficacious through the *infinitely perfect* SON *of* GOD.

39. The LOGOS is the *character* and *image* of *God*, and the *viceroy* of the great King; the true manna; the maker, and governour, and enlightener of the world; the *first-born* SON of the FATHER.

EUSEBIUS has given us the sentiments of the ancient Jews pretty much at large. They taught, that,

40. The *Second Cause* is the LOGOS of GOD, and GOD off GOD. They applied the history of Sodom and Gomorrah, the hundred and tenth, and the thirty third psalms, to the LOGOS of the Father, making him the fabricator of the universe.

41. Besides the GOD and FATHER of the universe, they introduce a *second person and divine power*, called the LOGOS, the WISDOM and POWER of God, who *fabricated the world, conducted all the dispensations of providence*, and to whom various passages of the Old Testament are applicable.

42. The LOGOS is the *charioteer* of God, and the CREATOR and GOVERNOUR of the world.

43. A TRIAD shines, a MONAD reigns in each; and the world was made by the WISDOM and LOGOS of God.

44. The LOGOS of God is the *second* PRINCIPAL, the *first-begotten*, the *co-adjutor* of the Father's council, the *image* of God, the *wisdom* of God, the *power* of God, the *general* of the host of the Lord, the *angel* of the great council, the *true light*, and the *sun of righteousness*.

After the *second* PRINCIPAL there is also a *third*, the HOLY GHOST, whom they deify and rank in the *first* and *royal dignity* of a PRINCIPAL of the universe.

45. The WORD of the everlasting God is eternal and the support of the universe.

46. *All the Hebrew Divines* acknowledged the HOLY GHOST to be GOD, and the *inspirer* of the prophets.

47. EZEKIEL, the Jew, who lived about two hundred years before Christ, makes the ANGEL *who spake to Moses out of the bush*, and the ANGEL *that destroyed the Egyptians*, to be the DIVINE LOGOS.

48. ARISTOBULUS, who lived near one hundred and fifty years before the Christian æra, makes the SECOND CAUSE the source of light,

of light, and the WISDOM spoken of by Solomon that existed before the heavens and the earth.

49. The GRECIAN *philosophers* got all their notions of the original of things from the law of Moses.

50. ORPHEUS says, that all the *ancient* LOGOS shines in the *immortal* MAKER of the world, and that he sits on the circle of the heavens and orders all that is.

The TESTAMENTS of the *twelve Patriarchs* were written towards the close of the second century.

51. The Testament of Levi says, *Messiah* was to be *God* and *Man*.

52. The Testament of Zebulon says, GOD shall be seen in the *figure of man*.

53. The Testament of Nephthali says, GOD shall appear *dwelling among men on earth*.

54. The Testament of Ashur says, THE MOST HIGH shall visit the earth in the *mask of man*, eating and drinking with them.

55. The Testament of Benjamin says, THE KING OF HEAVEN *appeared* upon *earth* in the *form* of *man* in a state of humiliation.

56. *Rabbi* JONATHAN says, the SPIRIT *of God*, mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis, was the *Spirit of mercies* from before the Lord.

57. BERESCHIT RABBA calls it the SPIRIT *of Messiah* the King.

58. *Rabbi* SIMEON called *himself*, his *son*, and *one of his scholars*, placed in a *peculiar* manner, the TYPE of all that is.

59. He compares GOD and his *two* POWERS to THREE *lights*.

60. He compares them again to THREE *heads contained in* ONE *head*.

61. He speaks of the word ELOHIM as containing a great mystery, and referring to a TRINITY in UNITY.

62. The TALMUDISTS are said to acknowledge most of the particulars revealed in the gospel concerning the *Saviour* of mankind.

63. The same TALMUDISTS apply the description of WISDOM in the eighth of Proverbs to *Messiah*, and declare it was to him God said, *Let* US *make man*.

64. There are THREE *co-eternal* primordial Heads.

65. MOSES, the son of Nehemannus, ascribes most of the DIVINE APPEARANCES in the OLD TESTAMENT to MESSIAH.

66. The Jewish book RESCHIT CHOCMAH says, There are THREE *Gods*, when explained in a certain way.

67. The Jewish book, called MIDRASCH TILLIM, makes mention of THREE *persons* by whom the world was made.

68. *Rabbi* PHINEAS saith, the HOLY SPIRIT rested upon Joseph all his life.

69. The HOLY SPIRIT, says he again, rested twenty years upon Ezekiel.

70. The ancient CABBALISTS distinguished God into THREE *lights*, and even call them by the names of FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST.

71. The Jews acknowledge CHRIST *taught* that he was GOD.

72. The modern Jews confess that MESSIAH when he comes is to be *born of a virgin.*

73. A Jewish prayer, composed against the Christians in the year of our Lord 52, takes for granted they were teachers of a TRINITY and the DIVINITY of *Christ.*

74. In another composition, the Jews acknowledge, that Christ and his disciples taught that he was GOD, *born* of a *virgin*, by the HOLY GHOST.

75. JOSEPHUS has left on record, that Christ was an extraordinary person.

76. The religious Jews believe that MESSIAH is to be GOD and MAN, and that he shall die for the sins of men.

The learned *Heathen* came under our survey in the,

SIXTH PART,

and we were not a little surprized to find, that they too were as firmly persuaded of a *Triplicity* in the DIVINE NATURE as the most enlightened of the Jews.

1. ZOROASTER delivered various things concerning the *complex* nature of the DIVINE BEING.

2. The ancient PERSIANS had their TRINITY.

3. The EGYPTIANS had both a name and hieroglyphic for the TRINITY.

4. MERCURIUS TRISMEGISTUS spake of *three Principals.*

5. ORPHEUS clearly asserted the *three Principals.*

6. PYTHAGORAS spake much concerning the same *three Principals.*

7. EPICHARMUS considered the LOGOS as the author of reason in man.

8. PARMENIDES asserted the TRIAD of *divine hypostases.*

9. SOCRATES intimates a full expectation of a *teacher*, whom he calls the DIVINE LOGOS.

10. EUPOLIS has the same ideas.

11. PLATO's opinions on this subject bear a striking resemblance to the doctrine of the CHRISTIAN TRINITY.

12. ARISTOTLE had some ideas of a divine teacher, who might be expected to appear among men.

13. ZENO makes the LOGOS the *creator* of the world, and calls him GOD the WORD, affirming that he is *eternal.*

14. The ROMANS, PHRYGIANS, and SAMOTHRACIANS were not entirely strangers to the *triple distinction*, though it is probable they knew little or nothing of the nature of it.

15. CICERO speaks of the THREE *guardians* of the universe.

16. Various

16. Various instances of a *triplicity* among the GREEKS and ROMANS.

17. VIRGIL hath said such things of some extraordinary child, as are little applicable to any merely human being.

18. SENECA, the tragedian, seems to have intimated some thing concerning the *three Principals.*

19. SENECA, the philosopher, was no stranger to the doctrine of a TRINITY.

20. PONTIUS PILATE informed Tiberius, that Christ was believed by many to be a *God.*

21. SIMON MAGUS had some notions, though extremely absurd, of the TRIPLICITY *in the Divine Nature.*

22. PLINY bore witness to the religious worship of Jesus Christ.

23. LUCIAN was well acquainted with the belief of the Christians concerning the TRINITY, and their practice in *worshipping* CHRIST.

24. ADRIAN speaks of some persons, who urged a patriarch of the Jews to the *worship* of CHRIST.

25. CELSUS acknowledges the Christians of his age believed *Christ* was GOD, and agreed with the Jews that the LOGOS is the SON of GOD.

26. ALEXANDER SEVERUS had it in contemplation to *build a temple to* CHRIST.

27. NUMENIUS calls the FATHER the *first*, and the WORD the *second* GOD.

28. PLOTINUS calls the LOGOS a *second* GOD—affirms that he is not separated from the *first* GOD—but that he is the *Son* of GOD. He, moreover, speaks at large of the *three Divine persons*, whom he expressly calls, *three persons* that are *principals*; and assures us this was no new doctrine, but taught by PARMENIDES and PLATO.

29. AMELIUS speaks of the WORD *of* GOD as the *Maker* of all things, and applies the description of him by St. John much in the same manner.

30. PORPHYRY says the LOGOS is *eternal*, and that the Christians weakly *worshipped* CHRIST.

31. CHALCIDIUS says the LOGOS of GOD is GOD, is *co-existent* with GOD, and a *venerable* GOD.

32. JULIAN the *Apostate* acknowledges that St. John denominated our *Saviour* GOD.

33. LIBANIUS says the Christians made CHRIST both GOD, and the SON of GOD.

34. HIEROCLES confesses, that the Christians proclaimed JESUS to be GOD.

35. PROCLUS calls the doctrine of *three Divine persons* subsisting in the GODHEAD, *The tradition of the* THREE GODS, the *divinely delivered theology*, and that *Psyche* dwells with the *paternal* mind.

36. The SCANDINAVIANS inculcate the *worship* of a TRIPLE *Deity.*

37. The

37. The MEXICAN INDIANS entertained some imperfect ideas of a TRIPLE *Divinity*.

38. The HINDOOS adore *three* principal deities, who are still but *one*.

39. The TARTARS and SIBERIANS adore *one* God under THREE denominations.

40. The CHINESE, in common with all the rest of the nations, are found to entertain ideas of a *threefold* distinction in the DIVINE NATURE.

41. The *inhabitants* of the SOUTH SEA ISLANDS are also found to entertain some ideas consentaneous to the doctrine of the TRINITY.

After all this, it would have been unpardonable to have passed over the sentiments of the CHRISTIAN FATHERS, who have spoken so much more fully upon these deep things of God, than either the *Jews* or the *Heathens* had done before them. We, therefore, took into consideration what they had advanced in the,

SEVENTH PART;

when it appeared that,

1—5. BARNABAS believed the pre-existence of Christ—that he was present at the creation of the world—that it was he to whom the FATHER said, *Let us make man*—that he was the Lord of the whole earth, before he took upon him human nature—that the sun is the work of his hands—that he existed in a state of glory brighter than that luminary before he assumed human nature—that he is appointed judge of quick and dead—that in his original nature he was incapable of suffering—that all things were made by him and for him—and that honour, power, and glory are forever to be ascribed unto him.

6—7. HERMAS believed that the SON of GOD is more ancient than any creature—that he was with the FATHER when the world was made—that he was in council with the FATHER upon that occasion—that he is great and without bounds—and that the whole world is supported by him.

8—19. Clement believed, that Jesus had a being before he was born of the virgin Mary—that the Corinthians had the *sufferings* of GOD always before their eyes—that Christians have one GOD, one CHRIST, and one SPIRIT of grace—that glory and majesty are eternally to be ascribed to Jesus Christ—that he sprung in a direct line from Abraham according to his human generation—that he made atonement by his blood, and is the proper object of prayer—that we ought to think of him as God, and the universal Judge of mankind—that he is to be worshipped, not only externally, but with all our inward powers—and that he existed as a spirit before he took upon him human nature.

20—43. Ignatius believed, that Christ was God—that he was God and man—that he was both made and not made—sprung from God

God and from Mary—passible and impassible—that he was conceived in the womb of Mary by the power of the Holy Ghost—that he appeared as God in the form of man—and was both *Son* of God, and son of man—before all ages the only-begotten SON and WORD, and made man of the virgin Mary—that he was *incorporeal* in a *body*—exempt from *sufferings* in a *suffering* body—and *immortal* in a *mortal* body—that he was with the Father before all ages, appeared in the end to us—and is his *eternal* WORD—that both the apostles and believers are subject to CHRIST, and to the FATHER, and the HOLY GHOST—that Christ is above all time, *eternal* and *invisible*, *impalpable* and *impassible*, in his higher nature, though made visible and subject to suffering, in order to procure the salvation of mankind—that he was a proper object of praise—raised himself from the grave—and, though present in the body with us men, was united to his Father in the spirit. This venerable martyr further believed our blessed Saviour to be a *proper object of prayer*, and *prayed to him* accordingly in the most direct terms, and upon the most solemn occasions. The believers also, who wrote an account of his martyrdom, conclude their narration with *a doxology* to the holy and undivided TRINITY.

44—48. POLYCARP believed that Jesus Christ is exalted at the right hand of his Father—that all things in heaven and earth are made subject unto him—that every living creature shall *worship* him—that he shall come to be the judge of quick and dead—that he is our everlasting High-Priest, and the Son of God—that God willed his Son to be incarnate for our salvation—and that Luke made known the *divinity* of Christ.

This same good man *served* Jesus Christ all the latter part of his life, calling him, in the face of his enemies, his King and his Saviour—*and died ascribing glory to* FATHER, SON, *and* HOLY GHOST.

49—53. The Roman governour at Smyrna strongly intimates, that the Christians of his time *worshipped* Jesus Christ. The believers of that church also, who wrote an account of his martyrdom, declare that they themselves did and should continue to *worship* Jesus Christ as the Son of God. And accordingly they three times over, in the course of a few lines, ascribe glory to the *three Persons* of the DIVINE NATURE, FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, in which ascription of glory and praise the transcribers of that Narrative likewise unite.

This is the evidence of the *apostolical Fathers*.

Let us now proceed to recapitulate the sentiments of the second century.

SECTION THIRD.

54. QUADRATUS, bishop of Athens, appears to have been of the true orthodox faith.

55. ARISTIDES, a philosopher of the same city, was equally orthodox.

56. The *first* FIFTEEN BISHOPS of Jerusalem to the year 136 were the same.

57. MILTIADES about 150, held the same opinions.

58. HEGESIPPUS was of the same faith.

SECTION FOURTH.

59—69. JUSTIN MARTYR, not the first who held the doctrine of the TRINITY—declares that he and his friends *worshipped* FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT—that Christ instructed them in *adoring* in this order—that Christ is the LOGOS, the SON, the FIRST-BEGOTTEN, and POWER of God, who became man—that he is not to be considered as mere man, but possessed of DIVINITY—that the LOGOS was the first power next to the Father and Lord of all, and that he was made man—that the LOGOS and SON of GOD is also GOD—that, after the Father, they *worshipped* the WORD of God, who became man—that he was GOD *off* GOD, pre-existed in the form of God, and was born man of a virgin—that this Begotten of God is sometims called the GLORY of the LORD, the SON, the WISDOM, and the ANGEL of God; sometimes GOD, LORD, and LOGOS—that he was GOD and became man—that he is the MAKER and GOVERNOUR of the universe. He, moreover, declares, that all these principles were not his own private opinions merely, but the common, well-known sentiments of Christians in these first and purest ages.

70. TATIAN also received the *pre-existence* and *divinity* of Jesus Christ.

71. ALEXANDER, the martyr, died professing the *worship* of Christ.

72—73. EPIPODIUS, the martyr, acknowledged Christ to be *eternal*—GOD and *man*—and GOD with the FATHER and HOLY GHOST.

74—75. MELITO, bishop of Sardis, speaks of Christ as *perfect* GOD and *perfect man*—as *true* GOD *eternally*—and declares that the Christians of his day together with the Father, *worshipped* CHRIST, who *is truly* GOD *before all ages*.

76—79. THEOPHILUS, of Antioch, declares that the WORD is the SON of God—that the first three days of the creation were types of the TRINITY, GOD, his WORD, and WISDOM—that the WORD was GOD, and sprung from God—and that when God said, *Let us make man*, he spake to his WORD and WISDOM.

80—81. ATHENAGORAS acknowledges the *three persons* of the DIVINE NATURE, and speaks of them pretty much at large, in a manner utterly inconsistent with every idea of Socinianism.

82. ANDRONICUS, the martyr, *invoked* and *worshipped* CHRIST.

83. ATHENOGINES, the martyr, *worshipped* Jesus Christ, and ascribed glory to FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT.

84. BLANDINA, the martyr, addressed her *dying prayer* to her blessed Saviour.

85—95. IRE-

85—95. IRENÆUS says, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, incarnated of the virgin Mary for our salvation—that it is the good pleasure of the invisible Father *every creature should bow to him*—— that he is our LORD, and GOD, and *Saviour*, and King, who shall judge men and angels, and reward or punish them according to their respective conduct—that this was the faith of the whole Christian world at the time he lived—that God made the whole universe of things by his WORD and SPIRIT—that Christ was GOD and *man* united—that he was *truly* GOD and *truly* LORD—being *invisible* he was made *visible*—being *incomprehensible* he became *comprehensible*—being *impassible* he became *passible*—and, being the WORD of GOD, he became *man*—that he *always existed* with the FATHER, but in due time became incarnate for the salvation of mankind—that he is GOD, and LORD, the *eternal* KING, the ONLY-BEGOTTEN, the *incarnate* WORD, the *holy* LORD, the *wonderful Counsellor*, the *mighty* GOD, the *Emmanuel*—that he redeemed us from death by his own blood—and that they who say he was nothing more than a mere man, have neither part nor lot in his salvation.

96—102. CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS stiles Christ the *living* GOD who was to be *adored*—says he was GOD and *man*—addresses him jointly with the Father—speaks of the TRINITY, and says that all things were made by Christ—that Christ is the Son of God, and GOD *in the form of man*—that the HOLY SPIRIT is *omnipresent*, and that the TRINITY is to be *adored*. He says, moreover, that the Son of God is the *Governour* of the universe—OMNIPRESENT—OMNISCIENT—and that to him all the hosts of heaven are in subjection.

The sum of the evidence contained in the third century stands thus:

SECTION FIFTH.

103. MINUTIUS FELIX testifies that the Christians of his day paid *divine honour* to Jesus Christ.

104—110. TERTULLIAN declares the faith of Christians at considerable length. He assures us that there is but one God—that he made all things out of nothing by his WORD—that this WORD is his SON, who appeared variously under the old dispensation to the Patriarchs in the name of God—that he became incarnate in the womb of the virgin, and earned salvation for the sons of men—that he was man and GOD, Son of man and Son of God—that the Father is God, the SON is GOD, and the HOLY GHOST is GOD, and *every one of them is* GOD—that the names of God the Father belong to Christ the Son—and that the WORD is in his *own right* GOD ALMIGHTY—that the FATHER, the SON, and the SPIRIT, constitute the DIVINE UNITY—that the LOGOS was the *wisdom* that assisted at the creation, and presided over the whole work—that he is a spirit off a spirit, a GOD off GOD, both GOD and the SON of God, and GOD-MAN.

111—116. ORIGEN affirms that there is but one God—that he made

made all things out of nothing by his Son—that this Son was begotten of his Father before every creature—that he emptied himself and became incarnate—that he was born of a virgin by the power of the Holy Ghost—that he *remained* GOD, though made man—that the SON of GOD is *omnipotent*—that he is the GOD of the *whole creation*—that we must *worship* the FATHER and the SON—and that they who say that CHRIST was *only man* are to be considered in the light of heretics.

117—131. CYPRIAN says, that JESUS CHRIST is the GOD and LORD of Christians, and is to be *adored*—that the TRINITY was to be revealed to the world under the Christian dispensation——that the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, are ONE—that the WORD and Son of God is the messenger of salvation—that he was the POWER, the WORD, the WISDOM, and the GLORY of God—that he descended into the womb of the virgin Mary, was made man by the power of the Holy Ghost—and thus GOD *united himself to man*—that he was the FIRST-BEGOTTEN and WISDOM of the FATHER, by whom all things were made—that the *Angel* who appeared to the patriarchs was CHRIST and GOD—that CHRIST is GOD, and SON of GOD, and GOD and *man*, and Saviour of the human race.

132—133. GREGORY, of Neocæsarea, speaks fully of the Divine nature. Among other things to the same purpose he says:—The FATHER *always had a* SON, and the SON a SPIRIT. There was *always* the same TRINITY without change or turning.

134—135. DIONYSIUS ALEXANDRINUS calls Christ *uncreated*, and the *Creator*—GOD *by nature*—the WORD of the Father—*consubstantial with the* FATHER—GOD *over all*—*the* LORD *and* GOD *of Israel*. He says, moreover, the SPIRIT is GOD, and ascribes *glory* to FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT.

136—138. DIONYSIUS ROMANUS says, the DIVINE WORD and HOLY SPIRIT must be united to the GOD of the universe, and and the *sacred* THREE must be gathered together into ONE. He says also, that it is blasphemy to say the Lord was made with hands—and that the DIVINE TRINITY and MONARCHY must be preserved.

139—140. CAIUS, presbyter of Rome, spake of the divinity of Christ as the WORD of God, saying that many psalms and hymns were anciently composed in *honour* of CHRIST. He calls him likewise *true* GOD, and says he sprung in an ineffable manner from the Father.

141—146. HIPPOLITUS, bishop and martyr, speaks very clearly of the TRINITY, and ascribes *glory* to FATHER, SON, and HOLY SPIRIT.

147. AFRICANUS also ascribes *glory* to the *sacred* THREE.

148. In the time of PAULUS SAMOSATANUS *psalms were* usually *sung* in *honour* of our LORD JESUS CHRIST—and the six bishops who wrote against his errors call Christ the Wisdom, Word, and Power of God—GOD and the SON of GOD.

149—152. NOVATIAN

149—152. NOVATIAN has written a treatise expressly on the TRINITY, and constantly speaks of Christ in the highest stile of *deity*, but yet as GOD and *man united*.

153. THEOGNOSTUS speaks of the *Son* as GOD off GOD, possessing *all* his FATHER's nature.

154. LUCIAN, the martyr, delivered his opinion on the nature of our blessed Saviour in very strong terms, and much in the spirit of the Nicene creed, only with greater copiousness of expression.

155—157. METHODIUS, the martyr, says, that though the WORD was GOD, he took upon him human flesh, that he might set us an example.

158. PORPHYRIUS, the martyr, invoked JESUS, the SON of GOD, surrounded with flames.

159. ACACIUS, bishop of Antioch, calls JESUS CHRIST the most *powerful* GOD.

160. SAPRICIUS, the martyr, in the year 260, declared to his persecutors, We Christians acknowledge CHRIST to be *true* GOD, and the CREATOR of heaven and earth, and of all things therein.

161. PIONIUS, the martyr, and his companions confessed boldly to their persecutors, that *they worshipped* CHRIST, the WORD of God, and the CREATOR of all things.

162. PIERIUS, a man of great eminence, was sound in the faith of CHRIST's *divinity*.

The sum of the evidence in the fourth century is this:

SECTION SEVENTH.

163. A whole CITY in Phrygia were burnt to death while at their devotions in the church, "*calling upon* CHRIST, the GOD *over* "*all*."

164. ST. FELIX, the martyr, died *invoking* CHRIST, and ascribing *glory* to him forever.

165. THELICA, the martyr, died *praying* to CHRIST, and calling him by various names peculiar to Deity.

166. VITALIS, the martyr, in his dying moments, *invoked* JESUS CHRIST as his Saviour and his GOD.

167. Victor, the martyr, avowed before his tormentors both the DEITY and humanity of CHRIST.

168. EUPLIUS, the martyr, said to his tormentors, exhorting him to worship the Gods, "I *adore* CHRIST. I *adore* the FATHER, "and the SON, and the HOLY GHOST. I *adore* the HOLY "TRINITY, besides which there is no God."

169. AFRA, the martyr, *addressed* JESUS CHRIST as ALMIGHTY LORD GOD, and ascribed *glory* to FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT, in her last moments.

170. FAUSTUS, JANUARIUS, and MARTIALIS, martyrs, confessed to their tormentors, "We are Christians, who confess "Christ, who is the one Lord, *by whom we and all things were* "*made*. Martialis in particular said, There is *one only* GOD, the

" FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, to whom praise and " glory are due."

171. PHILEAS, bishop and martyr, boldly replied to the President who tormented him, that CHRIST was GOD.

172. QUIRINUS, bishop and martyr, declared openly to his tormentors, that CHRIST is *true* GOD.

173—175. PETER, bishop and martyr, acknowledged both the *divinity* and humanity of our SAVIOUR in strong terms.

176—178. ARNOBIUS is a warm advocate for the *divinity* of CHRIST, and the religious homage which is due unto him. He calls him GOD, the *sublime* GOD, and, moreover, gives the reasons why he took upon him the nature of man.

179. A HEATHEN in Arnobius objects to Christians their daily *worship* of a man that was born and crucified with vile persons.

180—183. LACTANTIUS assures us Christ was both GOD and *man*, compounded of two natures. He reasons at large upon the subject.

184. ALEXANDER, of Alexandria, assures us the errors of the Arians were never heard of till they were broached in his time by that denomination of men.

185—186. EUSEBIUS of Cesarea tells us, that the SON is *perfect* GOD off GOD, *co-existing always* as a son with the father—that he pre-existed, and appeared as a man and angel all through the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations.

187. J. FIRMICUS MATERNUS calls Christ GOD, and the *almighty* GOD—says that the WORD of GOD united himself with a human body, and is an object of *religious adoration*.

188. ATHANASIUS says CHRIST is *naturally* and *substantially* the SON of the FATHER—of the *same essence* with him—his only-begotten WISDOM—his *true* and *only* WORD—*truly* and *properly* GOD, being of *one substance* with the FATHER.

189—192. MACARIUS says GOD became man—appeared to the fathers in the first ages of the world—took our nature upon him in the fulness of time, and in that nature was crucified. He, moreover, ascribes *glory* to FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST.

193—195. HILARY wrote largely on the TRINITY, and says it is *immense* and *incomprehensible*—that JESUS CHRIST is *true* GOD—and ascribes *glory* to the FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT.

196. AUSONIUS says, *the one* GOD *is three*—*invokes* these *three Persons*—and calls *Christ very* GOD *off very* God.

197. ST. CYRIL calls Christ, GOD *begotten off* GOD—and the WORD of GOD. He says, we ought to have the same notions of the HOLY SPIRIT as of the FATHER and SON—that he is *almighty* and *omniscient*, and ought to be *honoured* as the FATHER and the SON, being *one* and the *same* DIVINITY.

198. GREGORY NAZIANZEN was one of the most able of advocates for the doctrine of the Trinity. He has several discourses upon the subject, in one of which he says—We ought to hold *one* GOD, and to confess *three* SUBSISTENCES.

199. ST.

199. ST. AMBROSE says, there is *one* GODHEAD in the *three*, and there are THREE in whom is *one* GODHEAD, there being no confusion in the UNITY, neither any difference in the TRINITY.

200. ST. BASIL was one of the most able and learned defenders of the doctrine of the TRINITY in the first ages, and hath spoken at large upon the subject against all its opposers.

201. QUINTUS PRUDENTIUS addresses prayer both to the SON of GOD, and to each of the Persons of the DIVINE NATURE separately.

202. St. CHRYSOSTOM confessed and wrote in defence of the GODHEAD of the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, as being all one, adding thereunto a *Trinity* of *Persons*.

203. ST. AUGUSTINE was the great champion of his day for the doctrine of the TRINITY against its opposers of every description.

204. THEODORET applies most of the passages, quoted from the Old Testament in the former part of this Treatise in proof of the *pre-existence* and *divinity* of CHRIST, in the manner we have done, and as it seems to have been customary to do in these early ages.

205—222. Miscellaneous circumstances in proof of the same doctrines.

This is the sum of the evidence to these evangelical principles, be it what it may. The reader will conscientiously weigh the whole, and form his judgment accordingly.

THE END.

22 JY 69

INDEX.

A.

Page

ABBADIE'S opinion on the expression, My Lord and my God — — 188
Acacius, Biſhop of Antioch, confeſſion of — — 569
Adam, applied to Chriſt by the ancient Jews — 268
Ægyptians, ancient, held the doctrine of the Trinity — 474--476
Africanus, worſhipped the Trinity — 565
Afra, the martyr, worſhipped Jeſus Chriſt — 573
Alexander, of Alexandria, advice of, concerning prying too deep into the nature of Chriſt — 228
doctrines of — — 578
Alexander, the martyr, a worſhipper of Chriſt — 535
Allix, Peter, opinions of, on the N. T. quotations from the Old 84
on Jeremiah 23. 6. — 126
thoughts of, on the council of Nice — 599
Ambroſe, St. on the deity of the Holy Ghoſt — 363
doctrines of — 585
Amelius, the platonic philoſopher, applies John 1. 1. to the Logos — — 299, 489
Andronicus, a worſhipper of Chriſt — 538
Angels, frequently called men, in ſcripture — 57, 58
Antioch, ſynod of, applied divine appearances in the O. T. to Chriſt — — 153
council of — — 596
Apocryphal books, on the plurality of the Divine Nature — 439
Appearances, divine, ſome account of — 136
Appeal, of the orthodox, to antiquity for the divinity of Chriſt 595
Apthorp, Dr. on Iſaiah 9. 6. — — 108
Aratus, quotation from, on the omnipreſence of Jupiter — 359
Arians, congregations of, generally decreaſe — 6
ancient, ſpeak of Chriſt as the Creator — 277
Arian interpretation of the introduction to St. John's Goſpel 304
Arius, ſome account of — — — 601
Ariſtobulus, an ancient Jew, ſentiment of, on the Logos 459--461
Ariſtotle, expected a divine teacher — — 481
Ariſtides, the Athenian philoſopher, orthodox — 519
Arnobius, doctrines of — — 574, 575

Artemon,

Artemon, ſome account of — — — 601
Aſclepiades, a worſhipper of Chriſt — — — 570
Athanaſius, St. applied the divine appearances of the O. T. to Chriſt — — — 154
on Chriſt's being the Son of God — — 227
ſentiments of, on the Trinity — — 365
doctrines of — — — 580, 581
appeal of, to the ancients for the divinity of Chriſt 594
Athenagoras, on the Son's being one with the Father — — 211
aſcribes creation to Chriſt — — — 288
on the Holy Spirit — — — 331
doctrines of — — — 536--538
Athenogines, a worſhipper of the Trinity — — — 538
Atonement, a proof of the divinity of Chriſt — — — 43
ſhort view of the doctrine of the — — 44-46
Auguſtine, St. on God's paternity — — — 210
doctrines of — — — 589, 590
appeals to the ancients for the divinity of Chriſt 595
Auſonius, confeſſed the Trinity — — — 583

B.

BACON, Lord, on the advancement of learning, quoted — 15
declares in favour of the Trinity — — 43
Baptiſm, inſtitution of, Mat. 28. 19. ancients and moderns upon the, at large — — — — 411--415
Barnard, Rev. James, quotation from — — — 24, 25
Barnabas, St. on the pre-exiſtence of Chriſt — — — 275
aſcribes the creation of the ſun to Chriſt — — 288
on the dominion of Chriſt — — — 324
doctrines of — — — 506, 507
Barrington, Lord, conjecture of, on Saul's converſion — — 243
Barrow, Dr, ſentiments of, on the Trinity — — 376, 377
Baruch, book of, ſpeaks of our Saviour — — — 445
Baſil, St. applied the divine appearances to Chriſt — — 154
a fine paſſage from — — — — 333
doctrines of — — — 585--588
Bell, Dr. on the miſſions of John and Chriſt — — 182
Bellamy, Dr. a quotation from, on the divinity of Chriſt 214, 215
Berriman, Dr. on the Trinity, recommended — — — 377
Bereſchit, Rabba, on Gen. 1. 2. — — — 463
Beryllus, Biſhop of Boſtra, ſome account of — — — 601
Bias, the philoſopher, aſcribes all good to God — — 346
Biſhops, 15 firſt of Jeruſalem, orthodox — — — 519
Blackwall, Rev. Ant. on ſcriptural myſteries — — — 31
on the phraſe—God's own Son — — 266
Bleſſing, of Moſes, explanation of — — — 388--390
Blindneſs, judicial, to be dreaded — — — 22
Books, on the Holy Spirit, recommended — — — 347, 348

Boyle,

Boyle, Robert, two quotations from — — 66, 67
Browne, Bishop, a fine quotation from — 211--213
Brucker, opinion of, on the Fathers — — 517, 518
Bull, Bishop, on the ancient church, recommended — 14
applied the divine appearances to Christ — 140
on Col. 1. 16, 17. — — 277
quotation from — — 498
Burnet, Dr. on the caution of Christ — 190, 191
on the manner of Christ's working miracles — 221
Burnet, Bishop, on Stephen's adoration of Christ — 251, 252
on the atonement, recommended — 291
Burgess, Rev. Mr. on Christ's pre-existence — 201, 202
on his declaring himself the Son of God 224, 225
on the worship of Christ — 249
Burgh, Dr. on Phil. 2. 5—8. — 274
Butler, Bishop, Analogy of, quoted — — 10
on the atonement, recommended — 291

C.

CAIUS, doctrines of — — 563, 564
appeal of, to the ancients — 594
Calcedon, council of — — 600
Calvin, John, on the divinity of the Spirit — 363
Campell, Dr. on the two first chapters of Matthew and Luke 182
Carus, emperor of Rome, adopted his two sons — 7
Carthage, council of, by Cyprian — — 596
Catholic construction of John 1. 1—12 — 306
Celsus, testimony of, to the worship of Christ — 487
Cerinthus, story of, concerning the bath, a proof of the early reception of Christ's divinity — — 47
some account of — — 600
Chalcidius, acknowledged the three principals — 489
Cheyne, Dr. received the Trinity — — 43
Chinese, worship a Trinity — — 492
Christ, divinity of, rejected with danger — 4
necessary to the decorum of scripture 46, 47
necessary to his being a proper mediator 48
argued from the ancient heresies — 55
objections to, answered — ibid.
a treatise on, from the French — 206
the doctrine of the Reformers — 56
either superior to man, or an impostor — 230
simple humanity of, an absurdity — 136, 137
invocation of, a proof of his divinity — 246--261
worshipped early through the most distant countries 256
the Son of God before the creation — — 278
called the great God — — 281
the creator of the world — 286--288
worship of, common before Justin Martyr — 485

Christ, testimony to, A. D. 134 —— 487
worshipped, A. D. 230 —— 487, 488
Chrysostom, St. on the worship of Christ —— 249
on the authority of the Spirit —— 364
adores the Trinity —— 369
a passage from —— 402
doctrines of —— —— 588, 589
Churches, ancient, both eastern and western, over-run by conquerors for the corruptions which prevailed in them 6
Cicero, ascribes the design of saving his country to God 338
ascribes all good to God —— 341, 367
speaks of a Trinity —— —— 482
Clarke, Dr. book of, on the Trinity, thoughts on —— 17, 18
opinion of, on the Socinians —— 26
his view of the doctrine concerning the Son of God 28
his view of the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit 29
his view of the doctrine concerning the Trinity 30
on the expression, My Lord and my God — 189
on Christ's coming down from heaven — 193
on, Before Abraham was, I am —— 198
on Christ's calling God his Father — — 217
on Christ's saying, Thy sins are forgiven — 220
on the worship of Christ —— 248
on Col. 1. 16, 17 —— —— 277
applies all the divine appearances in the O. T. to Christ —— 284
on the introduction of St. John's gospel 305, 306
allows that Christ is truly God —— 322
reflections on the Scripture Doctrine of 500--502
Clemens, Romanus, considers the scripture as inspired — 85
on the two natures of Christ — 263
alludes to Phil. 2. 5—8. —— 275
doctrine of —— 507--509
Clemens, Alexandrinus, declares in favour of the Son's pre-existence —— —— 97, 165
applies the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ — 152, 164
on Christ's omniscience — 234, 295
alludes to Phil. 2. 5—8. — 275
on the omnipotence of Christ 324
ascribes ubiquity to the Spirit — 339
doctrines of —— — 547--549
Conybeare, Bishop, applies the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ —— —— 141
Constantinople, council of —— —— 599
Councils, first occasions of —— —— 595, 596
Creation of the world ascribed to Christ by all antiquity — 287
raises his character beyond conception —— ibid.
Creation of man, the Father spake to the Son at the 381, 384

Crellius applies all great characters to Christ, and yet considers him as mere man — — — 286
Cudworth, short view of the Heathen Trinity from — 478, 479
Cyclopædia, of Chambers, Heathen doctrine of the Trinity from — — — 471--473
Cyprian, St. applied divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ 153
on the miraculous conception — — 178
calls Christ our Lord and God — — 188
on Christ's raising himself — — — 207
on his being called God — — 215, 216
on the worship of Christ — — 259, 260
on Rom. 9. 5. — — — 265
a fine passage from, on the Spirit — — 356
a prayer of, to the Spirit — — 369
doctrines of — — — 558--561
Cyril, St. applied the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ 154
on Christ's being the Son of God — 227
doctrines of — — — 583

D.

DEUT. 6. 4 refers to the Trinity — — — 391
Dionysius, Romanus, doctrines of — — — 562, 563
Dionysius, Alexandrinus, ascribes eternity to Christ — 289
doctrines of — — — 562
Docetæ, errors of, a proof of Christ's divinity — — 602
Doddridge, Dr. on Christ's declaring himself one with God 211
Lectures of, recommended — 223
on the blood of God — — — 245
on Rom. 9. 5. — — — 264
on Col. 2. 9. — — — 278
declaration of, on the introduction to St. John's gospel — — 304
on Alpha and Omega — — 325
Doxologies to the Trinity from the Ancients — — 423, 424
Dryden, John, Esq. quotation from — — 470

E.

EBION, contemporary with St. John — — 298
some account of — — — 600
Ecclesiasticus, book of, speaks of the Son of God — 442, 443
Ellis, Dr. book of, quoted — — 8, 24
Elohim, a plural noun, shewn at large — — 377--384
objections to, considered — — — 388
Ephesus, council of — — — 600
Episcopius, on the love of God to man — — 204
Epistle of St. John, expressions of, illustrated — 315, 316
Epicharmus, speaks of the Logos — — 477, 478
Epipodius, doctrines of — — — 535
Esdras, books of, speak of the Son of God — 440--442

Eusebius, on the divine appearances of the O. T. — 173--175
applies Is. 6. to Christ — — 169
applies 45 psalm to Christ — — 170
on the opinions of the ancient Jews — 452--458
doctrines of — — 578, 579
Eupolis, expected the Logos to come — — 479
Euplius, the martyr, a worshipper of Christ — 572
Eveleigh's two sermons on the Trinity, quoted — 7, 132
Evans on the atonement, recommended — 317
Ezekiel, an ancient Jew, sentiments of, on the Logos 458, 459

F.

FATHERS, Christian, applied the Word to Christ — 300
doctrine of, concerning Christ, the Spirit, and the Trinity — — 498--594
utility of the writings of — — 498--500
Felix, Minutius, admitted the worship of Christ — 250
St. the martyr, a worshipper of Christ — 572
Fenelon, Mon. great humility of — — 17
Fiddes, Dr. quotation from — — 24
on the worship of Christ — — 186
on Christ's high professions — — 209, 210
on Christ's being one with God — 216
on Rom. 9. 5. — — 265
summary of the sentiments of the Fathers, from 592--594
Firmicus, Maternus, confessed the divinity of Christ — 580
Fletcher, Rev. John, arguments of, against Dr. Priestley 18--21
vindicates the doctrine of the Trinity against the charge of being like transubstantiation — — 51--53
Fleming, on the divine appearances of the O. T. — 167
Forbes, Duncan, thought of, on the Trinity — 416
Fuller, Rev. Andrew, book of, recommended — 270

G.

GENTLEMAN's Religion quoted on Mark 13. 32. — 60
Genesis, first two verses of, contain the Trinity — 377
Gibbon, Ed. Esq. gives an account of the Logos — 299
Gilpin, Rev. Mr. on Acts 20. 28. — 245
on Rom. 9. 5. — — 264
on 1 Tim. 3. 16. — 280
on the atonement — — 291
God, right knowledge of, of great importance — 1
unity of, essential in religion — — 11
perfections of, all incomprehensible — 67, 68
Gospel, scheme of, attended with some obscurity — 14
rejected by many — — 16

Gospel, St. John's, introduction of, illustrated — 297--313
Grabe, Dr. on Rom. 9. 5. —— —— 265
Gray, Rev. Mr. on Christ's divinity —— —— 220
Gregory, Dr. Francis, on images of the Trinity — 36
bishop of Neocæsarea, doctrines of — 561, 562
Green, Mr. translation of the 110 psalm, by —— 94
2 Sam. 23. 1—7, by —— 96
Hab. 3. chap. by — 171
Grotius, Hugo, vindicated from Socinianism —— 26
illustrates the doctrine of the Trinity — 33, 36
on the worship of Christ —— 248
on the atonement of Christ — — 291
on the opinions of the ancient Jews — 466, 467

H.

HABAKKUK the third chapter of, applied to Christ 170--173
Hammond, Dr. applied all the divine appearances in the O. T. to Christ —— —— 139
on the expression, My Lord and my God 189
Harwood, Dr. on Christ's pre-existence 194, 196, 199, 200, 271
on the glory of Christ at the head of nature 138
Hawker, Dr. on Christ's pre-existence — 195, 196, 201, 271
sermons on Christ's divinity, quoted — 13
on the glory of Christ at the head of nature 137, 138
on the first chap. of Hebrews —— 283
on the personality of the Spirit —— 370
Hey, William, Esq. book of, on the divinity of Christ — 8
Hebrews, epistle to the, excellence of —— 282--283
Heathen, doctrine of, concerning the Trinity —— 470 496--497
Heresies, ancient, some account of — — — 24, 25
Hervey, Rev. James, on Zech. 13. 7. —— 131
Hermas, on Christ's pre-existence — — — 197
on the power of Christ —— —— 324
doctrine of — — — 507
Hetruscans, had their triple deities —— —— 482
Hegesippus, orthodox in the faith — — 520, 521
Hierocles, confesses Christ was held as God —— 491
Hilary, St. applied the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ —— —— 154
doctrines of —— —— 582
Hindoos worship a Trinity —— —— 491
Hippolitus, doctrines of —— —— 564, 565
Horne, Bishop, discourse of, on the Trinity — — 12
on the worship of Christ — — 255, 256
Horsley, Bishop, on the reproaches of Socinians — 23
on Saul's conversion —— — 244
on the Heathen Trinity —— 494--496
on the use of the Fathers —— 498

Howe,

Howe, Mr. a passage from on the Trinity — 430
Hurd, Bishop, on God made manifest — — 280
Hurrion, thoughts of, on the Spirit — — 334
on the worship of the Spirit — — 363
reasons of, why the Spirit is not so frequently worshipped — — 368
Huss, John, death of, predetermined — — 17

I.

IGNATIUS, St. on Christ's pre-existence — 197
on Christ's raising himself — 207
on Christ's omniscience — 233
calls Christ our God and Saviour — 239
speaks of the passion and blood of God 245
on the worship of Christ — 250
prayers of, to Christ — 257, 258
allusions of, to Rom. 9. 5. — 265
doctrine of — — 509--514
defence of — — 510, 511
Indies, East, doctrine of the Trinity believed, in the — 484
Irenæus, St. ranked the Ebionites among the heretics 25, 177
declares that the Word existed at the beginning 97
applies the divine appearances to Christ 152, 202
on Christ's saying, Thy sins are forgiven — 220
on the worship of Christ — 258
on Romans 9. 5. — — 265
on the pre-existent glory of Christ — 275
on Col. 1. 16, 17. — — 278
ascribes creation to Christ — — 288
gives an account of the writing of St. John's gospel 297
sentiments of, on the Trinity — — 364
says Messiah spake the decalogue — 164
says the Trinity created the world — 379
doctrines of — — 538--547
solemn obtestation of — — 540
fine epistle of — — 539, 540

J.

JENYNS, SOAME, Esq. on the Trinity — 435
on the atonement — — 436
Jerome, of Prague, eloquence of — — 17
Jerome, St. on the writing of St. John's gospel — 297, 298
Jews, expectations of, not to be regarded — 49--51
ancient, expected Messiah to be superior to Abraham, to Moses, and even to the angels — 82
called the Spirit Binah — 334
applied Is. 53 to Messiah — 117

Jews, testimonies of, to the Logos, the Spirit, and the Trinity ——— ——— 466--468
believed Messiah was to be born of a virgin —— 467
creed of ——— ——— 468, 469
Johnson, Dr. on the atonement ——— 317, 318
John 5. 7. authenticity of —— 320, 321, 372, 429
5. 20, 21. explained ——— 321, 322
Jones, Rev. Mr. book of, on the Trinity, referred to — 22
Preservative of, recommended —— ibid.
criticism of, on 2 Pet. 1. 1. —— 239
Jonathan, Rabbi, on Gen. 1. 2. ——— 463
Jortin, Dr. on Melchizedek as a type —— — 78
applies the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ —— — 284
grants the doctrine of Christ's divinity prevailed in the first and second ages — 518
Julian, the Apostate, applies the Logos to Christ —— 300
confesses that St. John preached the divinity of Christ 490
Judith, book of, ascribes creation to the Spirit — 334, 340
Justin Martyr, defence of ——— ——— 522--530
doctrines of ——— 531--534

K.

KENNICOTT, Dr. on Jos. 24. 19. ——— 392
Kett, Rev. Henry, on the writings of the Fathers — 499
Knox, Dr. Christian Philosophy of, partially recommended 359
Koran, applies the Logos to Christ ——— 300

L.

LACTANTIUS, doctrines of ——— 575--577
Lardner, Dr. on Phil. 2. 5—8. ——— — 274
Latimer, Bishop, death of, predetermined ——— 17
Law, Bishop, applied the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ ——— —— 141
Le Pluche, Mon. devotion of, to the church ——— 17
Leslie, Charles, Socinian controversy of, recommended — 38
Short Method with Deists of, a means of converting Gildon —— ibid.
his summary of the doctrine of the Trinity 38--43
Lightfoot, Dr. says, Christ was the giver of the Law — 165
applies the seven spirits to the Holy Ghost — 373
on the manifestations of the Trinity — 409, 410
Libanius, confesses the Christians made Christ God — 490
Lindsey, Rev. Theop. errs concerning the Logos — 147--151
attacks the weakest arguments of his opponents 22
rash assertion of —— —— 577, 578
Locke, John, Esq. on the morality of the gospel ——— 14
rejoices in the scripture revelation — — 23

Locke, John, no Socinian — — 27
Logos, appeared of old — — 146, 299
an account of, from the Ancients — 299--301
Lowth, Bishop, on the Septuagint of Isaiah — 123
Isaiah the 53 translated by — 115
on Isaiah the sixth chap. — — 398--400
Lowth, Dr. on Jer. 23. 6. — — 126
Lucian, the Heathen, bears witness to the Trinity — 485--487
Lucian, the Martyr, doctrines of — 568

M.

MACCABEES, second book of, thought to speak of Christ 443
Macarius, doctrines of — — 581, 582
Magus, Simon, attestation of, to the Trinity — 484, 600
Malbranche, Mons. declares for the Trinity — 43
Man, sinful, needs a Saviour — — 2
depraved, needs a Sanctifier — 1
Martyr, Peter, illustrates 1 Cor. 15. 24. — 64
on 2 Sam. 7. 23. — — 392
Martyr, Justin, calls Christ God, and the Lord of hosts — 87
considered all the divine appearances under the O. T. to be Christ — 152
on the angel who destroyed Sodom — 160
who wrestled with Jacob — 163
in the bush — — 164
on Christ's pre-existence — 197
on the worship of Christ — 258
ascribes creation to Christ — — 288
declares the Trinity was worshipped in his time 369
on the different characters of Christ — 92
Martialis, the martyr, worshipped the Trinity — 573
Maximinus, emperor of Rome, illustration from — 4
Maximus, partner of Maximinus — — ibid.
Mede, Joseph, on the authenticity of Revelation — 323
Melito, Bishop of Sardis, doctrines of — 535, 536
Methodius, Bishop of Tyre, doctrines of — 568, 569
Memra, the same as Logos — — 145--151
Mercury, Trismegistus, held the Trinity — 476
Mexican Indians held a Trinity — 491
Michaelis on the N. T. quotations from the Old — 84
Milner, Rev. Joseph, church history of, very valuable — 550
too severe upon Tertullian — ibid.
Milton, John, no Socinian — — 27
received the pre-existence of Christ — 142
address of, to the Holy Spirit — — 331
on the creation, recommended — 137
Miltiades, A. D. 150, orthodox — — 520
Minutius, Felix, considered Christ as more than man 549, 550

Miracles, manner of, a proof of Christ's divinity — 220--222
Moore, Dr. Henry, on the philosophy of the Trinity — 35
Moses, son of Nachman, applies the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ — 144, 145
opinions of, on the Logos — 465, 466

N.

NAZIANZEN, Gregory, asserts the pre-existence of Christ 302
two fine passages from — 332, 349
doctrines of — 584
Nazarenes, not the same as the Ebionites — 520
Newton, Sir Isaac, no Socinian — 26
on the authenticity of Revelation — 323
Nice, council of — 597
Novatian, book of, on the Trinity, quoted — 5
on Hosea 1. 7. — 102
on Is. 2. 22. — 104
on Christ's descent from heaven — 194
on Christ's pre-existence — 199
on Christ's omnipresence — 203, 204
on the power of Christ — 217
on his being the Son of God — 227
on the worship of Christ — 256
on Rom. 9. 5. — 265, 266
applies the story of Hagar to the Logos — 157
doctrines of — 566, 567
Numenius, the philosopher, calls Christ God — 488

O.

OPINIONS, some destructive, as well as infidelity — 24
Origen, declares for the Son's pre-existence — 97, 271
applies the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ 153
on the miraculous conception — 178
on the offerings of the wise men — 186
on Christ's power in raising himself — 207
on the worship of Christ 218, 248, 250, 251, 258, 259
on his being the Son of God — 227
ascribes glory to Christ — 240
on the eternity of Christ — 290
on the omnipotence of Christ — 324
on the Holy Spirit — 332, 371
worshipped the three Divine Persons — 365, 366
a passage from, on the Trinity — 408
doctrines of, more at large — 554--558
Orpheus, held the Trinity — 476, 477
Otaheite, inhabitants of, hold a Trinity — 493
Owen, Dr. John, declaration of, on Christ's divinity — 66
on the personality of the Holy Ghost 352, 353

P.

PARAPHRASES, Chaldee, quotations from, on the Logos 145--151
Parmenides, held a Trinity —— —— 478
Paul, St. treated with great indignity by Dr. Priestley — 282
a very superior writer to the Doctor — 282, 283
rescued from these base aspersions —— 296
Paulus, Samosatenus, council against ——— 565
some account of —— —— 601
Payne, Dr. on Christ's calling God his own Father — 219
Pearson, Bishop, on the word Emanuel —— —— 181
on the Creed, recommended ——— 228
on Jer. 23. 6. —— —— 125
proves that the Holy Ghost is God — 363
Persians, ancient, held the Trinity —— —— 474
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, doctrines of —— 573, 574
Philo Judæus, applies the divine appearances of the O. T. to the Logos ——— —— 144, 165
considers the angel at Sodom as the Word — 160
on the creation of man by the Messiah — 381
some account of ——— 446
sentiments of, at large, on the two Powers 447--452
Phrygia, a whole city in, worshippers of Christ —— 571
Phileas, Bishop of Thumis, confessed the divinity of Christ 573
Pilate, Pontius, held high notions of Christ —— 484
Plan, of this Apology —— —— 71, 72
Plato, doctrine of, concerning the Trinity —— 480, 481
Pliny allows Christians worshipped Christ in his time — 257, 485
ascribes the invention of arts to God —— 335
Plotinus, the Philosopher, on the three Principals — 488
calls the Logos, the Son, the Word, and the Image of God —— —— 289
Plurality of the Divine Nature, proofs of, — 377--407
Pocock, Dr. assures us the Son of God is the Word — 85
Polycarp, worshipped Christ ——— 257
dying ascription of, praise to the Trinity — 369
doctrines of ——— ——— 514--517
Porphyry, allows Christians worshipped Christ in his time 256, 489
Porphyrius, the martyr, a worshipper of Christ ——— 569
Prayer, an ancient one, to the Trinity —— —— 387
Price, Dr. on Christ's descent from heaven —— 194
on his pre-existence — 194, 200, 271, 272, 319
on the power and glory of Christ —— 236, 237
on the love of Christ which passeth knowledge 272
on Christ's being in the form of God —— 273
Priestley, Dr. begs the question on the Trinity and atonement 18
and St. Paul at issue ——— 143
degrades the Redeemer marvellously — 236
illustrates the introduction to St. John's gospel 303

Priestley,

Priestley, Dr. amuses himself with answering the weakest arguments of his opponents — 22
reflections on his treatment of the Fathers 503--505
gives up the Fathers of the second and third centuries as orthodox in the main — 518
Proclus, the Philosopher, confessed the Trinity — 491
Prophecies, epitome of, concerning Christ — 133
Prudentius, Quintus, a worshipper of Christ — 588
a passage from — — 385
Pythagoras, held the three Principals — 477

Q.

QUADRATUS, Bishop of Athens, orthodox — 518, 519
Quirinus, Bishop of Siscia — — 573
Quotations from the O. T. in the New, authors on — 84

R.

RAMSAY, Chevalier, quotation from, on the Trinity 470, 471
Randolph, Dr. complains of Mr. Lindsey's unfair dealing 22
on the expression, My Lord and my God — 189
on the caution of Christ — 190
on Christ's calling God his own Father 218, 219
on the Son of God — 267
assures us all the Ancients produce John 1. 1—14. as a proof of Christ's deity 304
Reason, not always attended to by us — 54, 55
Recapitulation of the evidence concerning the person of Christ from the O. T. — — 603--606
from the N. T. — 606--612
Recapitulation concerning the Spirit — 612, 613
concerning the Trinity — 613, 614
Racapitulation of the evidence concerning the Trinity from the ancient Jews — — 614--618
from the ancient and modern Heathen 618--620
from the primitive Christians — 620--627
Review, Critical, quoted concerning the opinions of Sir Isaac Newton — — 27
Righteousness, Lord our, remarks on — 122--126
Rittangelius, a Jewish convert, proves the divinity of Christ 464, 465
Rom. 9. 5. applied by all antiquity to Christ — 265
Romans, ancient, held a Trinity — 481, 482
Ruffinus, on the character of Father and Son — 202

S.

Sabbellian view of John 1. 1—14. — 302
Sandius, declares Socinus's sense of John 1. 1—14. to be new and unheard of — — 304
Sapricius, confessed Christ to be true God — 569, 570
Saurin, Mons. on Christ's divinity — 57

Scandinavians worshipped a Trinity —— 491
Schemes, of religion, all attended with difficulty —— 192
Schlictingius, the Socinian, allows that Stephen worshipped Christ 252
Seldon, John, extract from the Table Talk of —— 84
assures us the Son of God is the Word — 85
Seneca, the Phil. ascribes all ingenious inventions to God 335
all moral attainments to God — 337, 346
speaks of the Trinity —— —— 483, 484
Seneca, the Trag. speaks of a Trinity —— 483
Serpent, brazen, applied by the Talmud to the Logos — 79, 80
Sharpe, Dr. applied the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ —— —— 139
Sherlock, Dr. on the Socinian controversy, quoted — 14
Bishop, on John 8. 58. —— 199
Shepherd, Rev. Mr. on John 1. 1—14. recommended — 304
Shuckford, Dr. applied the divine appearances in the O. T. to Christ —— —— 139
Siberians, held a Trinity —— —— 492
Smalcius, the Socinian, denies them to be Christians who refuse worship to Christ —— 249
Socinians, congregations of, generally decrease —— 6
foreign, deny that our English ones are Christians 250
Socinian view of John 1. 1—14. —— —— 303
Socinus, a warm advocate for the worship of Christ —— 249
confession of, that orthodox believers had existed in the church from the beginning —— 527
Socrates, expected the Logos to come —— 479
Sodom, destruction of, a proof of plurality —— 385
Son of God, different meanings of that phrase — 226, 227
on his coming from heaven — 204, 266, 267, 319
Spirit, Holy, summary view of —— 374, 375
Spirit of God, scripture view of —— —— 331--375
Spirits, seven, explained —— —— 323
Stillingfleet, Bishop, on the Trinity —— 376
Swift, Dean, on things above and contrary to reason — 47
Synge, Archbp. a passage from, on the Trinity —— 425
Sysmatics, several, in the earliest ages, retained the doctrine of the Trinity —— —— 602

T.

TACITUS, the Historian, admits that the Christians worshipped Christ in his time —— —— 256
Targums, nature of, explained —— —— 73
quotations from —— 73, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81
curious account from, concerning three angels sent to Abraham —— —— 159, 160
Tatian, doctrines of —— —— 534
Taylor, Bishop, on Christ's descent —— 193

Tertullian, illustrates the doctrine of the Trinity by various similitudes —— —— 36, 37
considered the divine appearances in the O. T. as belonging to Christ —— 152
on the miraculous conception —— 178
on the offerings of the wise men —— 186
on Christ's descent from heaven —— —— 193
on the worship of Christ —— —— 259
on the two natures of Christ —— 264
on Rom. 9. 5. —— —— 265
on Phil. 2. 5—8. —— —— 275
on the omnipotence of Christ —— 324
on the Holy Spirit —— 331, 332
doctrines of —— —— 550--554
Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs on the Logos — 462, 463
Theophilus, of Antioch, applied the divine appearances to Christ 153
ascribes creation to the Spirit —— 335
doctrines of —— —— 536
Theophylact, infers that the Spirit is God —— 365
Theodoret, applied the divine appearances of the O. T. to Christ —— —— —— 155
doctrines of —— —— 590--592
Theodotus, the tanner, some account of —— 601
Theognostus, Alexandrinus, doctrines of — — 567
Thelica, the martyr, a worshipper of Christ —— 572
Tillotson, Archbp. 44th sermon of, recommended against Socinianism —— —— 69
on Christ's being in the form of God —— 273
on Christ's being called great God —— 282
on John 1. 1—14. at large — — 309--313
on the Heathen Trinity —— 473
1 Tim. 3. 16. observations on —— 279, 280
2 Tim. 2. 22. a criticism upon — — 256
Timoleon ascribes all good done by man to God — 346
Titus 2. 13. applied to Christ —— 281
Transubstantiation, not parallel to the Trinity —— 51--53
Tobit, allusion in the book of, to the Trinity —— 440
Trinity, doctrine of, not contradictory —— 32
illustrations of —— —— 33
doctrine of, incomprehensible — — 68
doctrine of, commonly received by the Ancients 601, 602
three persons of, contained in Gen. 1. 1, 2. — 377
an imperfect discovery, not a contradiction — 22
several symbols of the —— —— 380
mentioned upwards of an hundred times in the Bible 408
various reasonings on the —— 431--438

U.

UNITY, divine, not incompatible with a Trinity — 53, 54
Usher, Archbp. applies Joshua 5. 13--15 to Christ — 166

V.

VEYSIE, Rev. Daniel, on John 1. 1—14. —— 308
on the atonement, recommended — — 317
Victor, the martyr, confessed the divinity of Christ — 572
Virgil, speaks great things of a child to be born —— 483
Vitalis, the martyr, a worshipper of Christ — — 572
Voltaire, M. a ridiculer of the bible all his days —— 17

W.

WAKEFIELD, Mr. has taken undue liberties with the scriptures in his translation of the N. T. — 245, 246
on 1 John 5. 7. —— 373
Waterland, eight sermons of, quoted —— 11, 12
on the importance of the doctrine of the Trinity recommended —— 14
on similitudes of the Trinity —— 34
on Is. 9. 6. —— —— 108
on the safety of confessing Christ to be God 268, 269
on Heb. 1. 10. —— — 293, 294
Watts, Dr. life of, by Johnson and Palmer, quoted — 15
no Socinian —— —— 27
Watson, Bishop, on Heb. 1. 1. —— —— 285
Wesley, Rev. John, sermon of, on the Trinity —— 48
Whitaker, book of, on Arianism, quoted —— — 5
attempts to shew that Clarke died in the orthodox faith 27
on Christ's manner of working miracles — 221
White, Professor, sermons of, quoted —— 5
thoughts of, on Socinianism —— —— 27
Whitby, Dr. on Titus 2. 13. —— — 281
remark of, on an observation of Crellius — 286
Whiston, William, allows that Christ is truly Lord, and God, and God by nature — — 322
Wintle, Rev. Mr. on Dan. 9. 24—29 — — 128, 129
Wisdom of Solomon, book of, speaks both of the Word and Spirit of God —— 443--445
Witsius, Herman, observation of, on the seven Spirits — 373
Wogan, William, Esq. on Is. 2. 22. —— —— 104
Woltzogenius, the Socinian, allows that the disciples prayed to Christ to determine the lot —— —— 233
Word, of God, applied to Christ at large — 299, 301
Wynpersse, Van de, book of, on the divinity of Christ, recomm. 293

Y.

YOUNG, sermons of, quoted —— —— 46, 47

Z.

ZENO, speaks of the Logos —— 481
Zohar, sentiments of, on the Logos, the Spirit, and the Trinity —— —— 463, 464
Zoroaster, held the doctrine of a Trinity —— 472--474

An INDEX to the passages of the Bible that are more or less illustrated in the present volume.

GENESIS.

1. 1, 2.—331--334, 377--380.
1. 26. ——381--383.
3. 5.——384.
15. ——73.
22. ——383, 384.
6. 3.——334.
11. 7.——384, 385.
1--9. ——156.
12. 1--3. ——74.
14. 17--24. —78.
15. 1--18.——156.
16. 9--13. —— 157.
18. ——158--160.
19. 24. ——385.
20. 3--7. ——160, 161.
20. 13. ——386.
21. 12--21. —161.
22. ——161, 162.
26. 2--5. ——75.
28. 13, 14. —75.
10--17. —162.
31. 7.——386.
32. 24--30. —162.
35. 7.——386, 387.
41. 38. ——334.
48. 15, 16. —76.
49. 10, 18. —76, 77.

EXODUS.

3. 2--7. ——163.
12. 29, 30. —164.
17. 7.——78.
19. 3--6. ——164.
20. 5 ——387.
23. 20--22. —165.
24. 9--11.—— 165.
31. 1--3. ——335.
32. 1.——387.
34. 6.——387.
5. 30--35. —335.

NUMBERS.

6. 24--26. —388--390.
11. 24--26. —336.
21. 5—9. ——79.
22. 22--35. —166.
24. 1, 2. ——336.
17. ——81.
37. 18. ——337.

DEUTERONOMY.

4. 7.——390.
5. 26. ——390.
6. 4.——391.
18. 15--19. —82.

JOSHUA.

5. 13--15. —166.
22. 22. ——392.
24. 19. ——392.

JUDGES.

2. 1--23.——166.
6. 11--27. —166.
13. 2--23.——167.

1 SAMUEL.

2. 10. ——82.
4. 8.——394, 395.
10. 6, 10.——337.
11. 6.——337.
19. 18--24. —338.

2 SAMUEL.

7. 14. ——100.
23. ——392, 393.
23. 1--7. ——95, 96.
2, 3. ——339. 396, 397.

1 CHRONICLES.

28. 12. ——340.

JOB.

19. 25--27. —81.
26. 13. ——334.
33. 4.——334.
35. 10. ——393.

PSALMS.

2. 1--12. ——85.
8. ——86, 393.
16. ——86.
19. ——86.
22. ——86.
23. ——86, 87.
24. ——87.
33.6. ——393.
40. ——87, 88, 89.
43. ——89.
45. ——89, 90, 394.
47. ——90.
50. 1.——394.
58. 12. ——394.
61. ——91.
68. ——91.
69. ——91.
72. ——91, 92.
78. ——92, 394.
80. ——92.
82. 6.——395.
89. ——92.
97. ——92, 93.
102. ——93.
106. ——93.
110. ——94, 95, 395.
136. 1--3.——396.
139. 1. ——339, 340.
143. 10.——339.
149. 2. ——396.

PROVERBS.

1. 20--23. —341.
8. ——97--99.
9. 10. ——397.
30. 4.——99, 397.
31. ——397.

ECCLESIASTES.

5. 8. ——397.
12. 1.——397, 398.

SONG of SONGS.

2. 1. ——100.

ISAIAH.

2. 22.——104.
6. 1--3. ——169, 398--400.
7. 14.——104, 105.
8. 13--15. ——105.
9. 6. ——105--110.
10. 12. ——400.
11. 1--3. ——110, 400.
13. 13. ——400, 401.
22. 19. ——401.
26. 16. ——111.
28. 5.——111.
30. 27. ——167.
33. 22. ——401.
34. 16. ——401.
35. 3--5. ——111, 112.
40. 3--5. ——112.
9--10. ——112.
11. ——112, 113.
13. ——341, 401.
42. 1.——401.
44. 6.——113, 401, 402.
45. 14, 15. —113.
22, 23. —114.
24, 25. —114.
48. 16. ——342, 402.
49. 7.——402, 403.
52. 7.——114.
53. ——115--118.
54. 5. ——118, 402.
55. 4. ——118.
59. 19--21.—403.
61. 1. ——403.
63. 1--5.——118, 119.
8--10. —403, 404.
10, 14.—342, 343.
64. 4. ——404.
61. 1, 2.——119.

JEREMIAH.

10. 10. ——404.
17. 5--9.——121.
23. 5, 6.——122.
31. 31--34.—343, 344.
33. 16.——122--126.

EZEKIEL.

1. 12. ——344.
34. 23, 24, 29. 127.

36. 25--27.—345.
37. 12, 13.—345.

DANIEL.

2. 34, 35, 44, 45. 127.
4. 17. ——404.
26. ——404.
5. 11. ——346.
18-20. —404.
7. 9. ——404, 405.
13, 14. —127, 168.
9. 17. ——128, 405.
19. ——405.
24--27. —128, 129.

HOSEA.

1. 7. ——102, 405.
3. 5. ——103.
9. 7. ——346.
11. 1. ——103.
11. 12. ——406.
12. 3--5.——103.

JOEL.

2. 29. ——346.

AMOS.

4. 10, 11.—101.
6. 8. ——101.

MICAH.

5. 2. ——120.

HABAKKUK.

2. 5. ——347.
3. ——170--173.

HAGGAI.

2. 5--7.——406.
6--9.——129.

ZECHARIAH.

1. 7--11. —169.
2. 10, 11.—130, 406.
3. 1, 2. ——169.
7, 8.——130.
6. 12, 13.—130.
9. 9. ——130.
10. 12. ——131, 406.
11. 12, 13.—131.
13. 7. ——131.
14. 5. ——132.

MALACHI.

1. 6. ——406.
2. 15.——347.
3. 1. ——132.
4. 2. ——132.

1 ESDRAS.

4. 34--41.—440, 441.

2 ESDRAS.

2. 42--48.—441, 442.
7. 28, 29.—442.

TOBIT.

8. 5, 6.——440.

JUDITH.

16. 13. ——440.
14. ——334.

WISDOM.

1. 4--7.——443.
7. 22--30.—444.
9. 1, 4, 10, 11, 18.—444.
12. 1. ——445.
16. ——81.
16. 12. ——445.
18. 15. ——445.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

45. 5. ——442.
46. 5, 6.——442.
48. 3--5.——442, 443.
51. 10. ——443.

BARUCH.

3. 35--37.—445.

2 MACCABEES.

15. 27, 34.—443.

MATTHEW.

1. 18--23.—180.
20. ——349.
20, 21.—408, 409.
2. 11. ——186.
3. 9, 11. —409.
11. ——349, 350.
16, 17.—188, 350, 409,
7. 21. ——247. [410.
8. 28, 29.—187.
9. 6. ——221.
11. 27. ——202.
12. 8. ——203.
28.——350.
32.——350.
14. 33.——186.
16. 13--16.—185.
18, 19.—185.
17. 5. ——188.
25, 26.—203.
18. 19, 20.—203, 248.
19. 17.——58.
20. 23. ——59.
28.——208.
22. 41--45.—201, 350.
23. 8, 10. —207.
26. 53.——206.
63--66.—224.
27. 37.——187.
54.——187.
28. 18--20.—59, 229, 247,
248, 411-415.

MARK.

2. 5, 7.——220.
3. 11. 12.—187.
12. 36.——351.
13. 32. ——59.
14. 61--64.—225.

LUKE.

1. 16, 17.—177.
30, 35.—177--179.
41--43.—179.
76--79.—179.
2. 8--14. —179.
25--32.—180.
48.——205.
3 16, 17. —182.
4. 41.——187.
12. 12.——352.
22. 66--71.—226.
24. 49--52.—206, 255.

JOHN.

1. 1--14. —299--314.
15--18.—183.
23.——183.
29--34.—183.
37.——352.
49.——184.
2. 16, 19.—206, 207.
24, 25.—314.
3. 6. ——352.
13.——193.
3. 14, 15.—80.
16.——204.
27--36.—183, 184.
5. 17--23.—217--219.
22, 23.—248.
6. ——193, 194.
68--69.—184.
8. 16.——205.
18, 19. —205.
23.——195.
28, 29.—205.
35, 36.—205.
38.——195, 205.
42.——195.
49.——205.
54.——205.
56--59. —198, 199.
9. 35--37.—192.
10. 15.——202.
18.——207.
23--39.—210--216.
11, 25, 26.—207.
27.——184.
13. 3. ——95, 314.

14. 1, &c.——208, 209.
14.——248.
23.——208.
28.——60.
15. 15.——195.
16. 12--14.—191.
16. 13--15.—354.
25--30.—195.
30.——186,
17. 1.——205.
3.——61.
5.——196, 205.
8, 24.——197.
11, 21, 24, 25. 205, 206.
19. 6, 7.——226.
20, 22.——354.
26--29.—189, 190.
30, 31.—314, 315.
21. 17.——185.

ACTS.

1. 24, 25.—233, 234, 254.
2. 24, 30, 33. 234, 235, 264.
3. 14, 15.—235.
7. 52.——231.
55--60.—232, 251, 260.
8. 29.——356.
38, 39.—240, 356, 357.
9. 3--6.——244.
14, 21.—255.
10. 20.——357.
11. 12.——357.
13. 2, 4.——358.
15, 28.——358.
16. 6, 7.——358.
17. 28.——358, 359.
19. 2.——359.
20. 23, 28.—244--246, 359.
21. 11.——360.
22. 16.——249.
28. 25--27.—360.

ROMANS.

1. 3, 4.——263.
1. 7.——253.
8. 11.——361.
29.——270.
32.——265--267.
9. 1.——361.
9. 5.——264.
10. 12--14.—257.
11. 36.——420, 421.
14. 17, 18.—252.
15. 5, 6.——421.
15. 19.——362.
16, 20, 24.—253.

1 CORINTHIANS.

1. 2.——257.
2. 8.——267.
11.——362.
3. 16, 17.—363.
6. 19, 20.—363, 364.
8. 6.——62.
9. 9.——80.
10. 9.——78.
11. 3.——63.
13. 14.——365.
15. 24.——63.
47.——268.
16. 22.——268, 269.

2 CORINTHIANS.

5. 18--21.—269, 270.
8. 9.——270--272.
12. 7--9.——252.
13. 14.——423, 424.

GALATIANS.

4. 4.——272.

EPHESIANS.

3. 3.——367.
3. 19--21.—272, 425.
4. 5, 6.——65.
9. 10.——264.
6. 5--8.——253.

PHILIPPIANS.

2. 5--11.——273--276.
10, 11.—250.
3. 20, 21.—277.
4. 13.——277.

COLOSSIANS.

1. 16--19.—277, 278.
2. 2, 3, 9.—278, 426.

1 THESSALONIANS.

3. 11--13.—368--370.

2 THESSALONIANS.
2. 16. ——253.
3. 5. ——368, 426, 427.
1 TIMOTHY.
1. 12. ——253.
2. 5. ——65.
3. 16. ——279.
2 TIMOTHY.
2. 22. ——256.
4. 7, 8. ——281.
18. ——254.
HEBREWS.
1. 1--6. —98, 250, 283--292.
10--12. —293, 294.
2. 9, 16. ——294.
3. 1--6. ——294, 295.
7. ——370, 371.
4. 12, 13. —295, 296.
7. 1--10. ——78.
9. 8, 14. ——371.
12. 25, 26. —296.
13. 8. ——296.
JAMES.
2. 1. ——240.
1 PETER.
1. 2. ——427, 428.
1. 11, 12. —371.
3. 19--22. —235.
2 PETER.
1. 1. ——239.
11. ——239.
21. ——372.
2. 1--3. ——5.
1. ——239.
3. 18. ——239, 240, 254.
1 JOHN.
1. 1--3. ——316.
2. 1, 2. ——317.
3. 16. ——318.
4. 2, 3. ——319.
9, 10, 14. —319.
5. 7. ——319--321.
7, 8. ——372, 429.
14, 15. —249.
20, 21. —321, 322.
2 JOHN.
3. ——254.
JUDE.
3, 4. ——5, 240, 241.
14, 15. ——74.
24, 25. ——241.
REVELATION.
1. 1. ——65. [324
4--6. ——254, 255, 323,
7, 8. ——229, 324, 325.
11. ——229, 325.
17. ——229.
2. 23. ——229, 325, 326.
4. ——326, 327, 373.
5. ——326, 327.
8--13. ——259, 260.
7. 10. ——260.
19. 17. ——327.
21. 9, 10, 22, 23. 328.
22. 1, 3, 6. —328.
12, 13, 16. 201, 329.
20, 21. —254, 329, 330.

An INDEX of Writers quoted in this Apology, with the particular edition of their works to which we have referred.

Those marked with an asterism are quoted from some other writer, the original work not being in the author's possession.

AMBROSII opera, a Sorano, Par. 2 tom. 1632.
Arnobius adversus gentes, apud opera patrum, Lug. 1642.
Athanasii opera, Coloniæ, 2 tom. 1686.
Athenagoræ Legatio, apud opera Justini.
Augustini opera, a Guillard. Par. 1541.
Barnabæ epistola, a Voss. Amst. 1646.
Basillii Magni opera, 3 tom. Par. 1618.
Baxter's Works, 4 vols. London, 1707.
Biblia Polyglotta, a Waltono, 6 tom. 1657.
Bingham's Origines Eccl. 10 vols. London, 1710.
Blackwall's Sacred Classics, 2 vols. London, 1737.
Boyle's Works, 5 vols. London, 1744.
Bulli opera, a Grabe, London, 1703.
Burnet, Bishop, on the Articles, London, 1759.
Burnet, Thomas, de Fide, Lond. 1728.
Butler's Analogy, by Halifax, London, 1788.
Chysostomi Expositio in epistolas Pauli, 2 tom. 1596.
Chrysostom on the Priesthood, by Bunce.
Clarke's Scripture Doctrine, London, 1719.
Sermons, 11 vols. London, 1749.
Clementis Romani epistolæ, a Wotton, Cant. 1718.
Clementis Alexandrini, a Pottero, Ox. 2 tom. 1715.
Cudworth's Intellectual System, London, 1678.
Cypriani opera, a Pamelio, Par. 1632.
Cyrilli Hieros. opera, Lut. Par. 1631.
Dionysii Alexand. epistola cont. Paul. Samos. apud opera patrum, Lugd. 1642.
Dupin's New History of Ecclesiastical Writers, 8 vols. London, 1696.
Epiphanii opera, a Petavio, 2 tom. Coloniæ, 1682.
Eusebii Pamph. opera, a Robt. Steph. Lut. Par. 1544.
Fiddes's Theologia Speculativa, 2 vols. London, 1718.
Galatinus de Arcanis, Francofurti, 1612.
Grabii Spicilegium, 2 tom. Oxon. 1698.
Gregorii Naz. a Morel. 2 tom. Colon. 1690.
Hammond's Works, 4 vols. London, 1684.
Hippoliti opera, apud opera patrum, Ludg. 1642.
Ignatii epistolæ, a Voss. Amst. 1646.
Irenæi opera, a Feuardentio, Lut. Par. 1639.
Jones's Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, London, 1767.
Josephi Flav. opera, Genevæ, 1634.
Justini Mart. opera, Coloniæ, 1686.
Kett's Sermons at Bampton Lect. Ox. 1791.

Kidder's Demonstration of the Messias, London, 1726.
Lactantii opera, apud opera patrum, Lugduni, 1642.
Lardner's Works, 11 vols. London, 1788.
Leslie's Works, 2 vols. London, 1721.
Lightfoot's Works, 2 vols. London, 1684.
Millius in Novum Testamentum, Oxon, 1707.
Minutii Felicis Octavius, Cant. 1686.
Moore's Divine Dialogues, London, 1713.
Newton's Observations on Daniel and Revelation, London, 1733.
Novatianus de Trinitate, apud Tertul. opera.
Origenis opera, per Euseb. Epis. 2 tom. Basil, 1571.
Origen cont. Celsum, a Spencero, Cant. 1677.
Pearson on the Creed, London, 1692.
Philonis opera, a Gelenio, Lut. Par. 1640.
Polycarpi epistola, a Voss. Amst. 1646.
Prideaux's Connection, 4 vols. Glasgow, 1743.
Ramsay's Philosophical Principles of Religion, 2 vols. Glasgow, 1748.
Ruffinus in Symb. Apostolicorum.
Scott's Christian Life, 5 vols. London, 1747.
Stillingfleet on the Trinity, London, 1697.
Tatiani oratio ad Græcos, apud opera Justini.
Tertulliani opera, a Pamelio, Par. 1583.
Testamenta 12 Patriarch. apud Spicileg. Grabii.
Theophilus ad Autolycum, apud opera Justini.
Theodoret apud Kidder's Demonstration.
Tillotson's Works, 12 vols. London, 1748.
Wake's Apostolical Fathers, London, 1737.
Waterland's Eight Sermons at Lady Moyer's Lecture, Camb. 1720.
Waterland's Vindication, Camb. 1720.
Waterland's Importance of the doctrine of the Trinity, London, 1734.
White's Sermons at the Bampton Lecture, London, 1785.
Whitsii Miscellanea Sacra, Traject. ad Rhenum, 1692.
Whitsius de Œconomia, Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1694.

The quotations from, and references to, most of the other writers mentioned in this work, it is hoped, will be found sufficiently accurate for the purposes of consultation. It was not thought necessary to specify every one of them in this list, but only such as have undergone more or less alteration in the several editions through which they have passed. The very numerous translations from the Ancients are partly selected, but mostly original. The author wishes they may convey the sense of the several writers with competent precision. He can truly say, he hath not designedly perverted any expression to answer a purpose.

ADDENDA.

A concise scriptural view of the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

I. JESUS CHRIST *was in being before he was conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary.*

This appears from the following passages of the sacred writings.

1. He was the GOD, who fed Jacob all his life long, and the ANGEL, which redeemed him from all evil, to whom he prayed that he would bless the sons of Joseph. Gen. 48. 15, 16.

2. He was without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life. Gen. 14. 17—24. Heb. 7. 1—10.

3. The Israelites tempted CHRIST in the wilderness, and were destroyed of serpents. Ex. 17. 7. 1 Cor. 10. 9.

4. When Jacob returned to his own country he had power over the ANGEL, THE LORD OF HOSTS, with whom he wrestled. Gen. 32. 24—30. Hos. 12. 3—5.

5. His goings forth have been from of old, *from everlasting.* Micah 5. 2.

6. We were chosen in CHRIST JESUS before the foundation of the world:—we had grace given us in CHRIST JESUS before the world began:—GOD, who cannot lie, promised eternal life to us before the world began. Ep. 1. 4. 2 Tim. 1. 9. Tit. 1. 2.

7. JESUS CHRIST was in being when the foundation of the world was laid. John 1. 3. Col. 1. 16. Heb. 1. 2.

8. He preached by the SPIRIT in the days of Noah, before the flood. 1 Pet. 3. 19, 20.

9. JESUS CHRIST was David's *Lord* as well as David's *Son*; the *root* as well as the *offspring* of that illustrious king. Mat. 22. 41—45. Ps. 110. 1. Rev. 22. 16.

10. JESUS CHRIST came down from heaven. John 3. 13. Ibid. 6. 33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58, 62.—He had seen the Father. Ibid. 6. 46.—He was from above. Ibid. 8. 23.—He was not of this world. Ibid.—He spake those things which he had heard and seen with his Father. Ibid. 8. 26, 38.—He proceeded and came forth from God. Ibid. 8. 42.—He was before Abraham. Ibid. 8. 56—59.—He came from God. Ibid. 13. 3.—He made known to his disciples what he had heard of his Father. 15. 15.—He came out from God, and came forth from the Father. Ibid. 16.

25—30.—He had glory with the Father before the world was. Ibid. 17. 5.—His disciples knew surely, that Christ came out from God, and that God sent him. Ibid. 17. 8.—God loved Christ before the foundation of the world. Ibid. 17. 24.—Though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor. 2 Cor. 8. 9.—God sent forth his Son made of a woman. Gal. 4. 4, 5.—Jesus Christ was in the form of God, and took upon him the form of a servant. Phil. 2. 5, 6.—He is the Lord from heaven. 1 Cor. 15. 47.

II. JESUS CHRIST *was, with his* FATHER, *the* CREATOR *of the world.*

This appears from the following passages of holy scripture.

1. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. John 1. 3.

2. He was in the world, and the world was made by him. John 1. 10.

3. To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. 1 Cor. 8. 6.

4. God created all things by Jesus Christ. Ep. 3. 9.

5. By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. Col. 1. 15—17.

6. By his Son God made the worlds. Heb. 1. 2.

7. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands. Heb. 1. 10.

III. JESUS CHRIST, *in his higher nature, is the true and only-begotten Son of God.*

This appears from the following passages.

1. Lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Mat. 3. 17.

2. Behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them; and behold, a voice out of the cloud, which said; This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Mat. 17. 5.

3. Simon Peter said to Jesus, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Mat. 16. 16.

4. We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. John 1. 14.

5. God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son. John 3. 16.

6. He hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God. John 3. 18. See too John 5. 18. John 19. 7. 1 John 4. 9.

7. God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh. Rom. 8. 3.

8. He

8. He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. Rom. 8. 32.

9. God hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son. Col. 1. 13.

10. God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who was the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person. Heb. 1. 1—3.

11. Christ was a Son over his own house. Heb. 3. 6.

IV. JESUS CHRIST *is of the same nature, and equal with his everlasting Father.*

This also appears from the following scriptures.

1. Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man that is my Fellow, saith the Lord of hosts. Zech. 13. 7.

2. He said God was his Father, making himself equal with God. John 5. 18.

3. What things soever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise. John 5. 19.

4. We stone thee for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. John 10. 33.

5. I and my Father are one. John 10. 30.

6. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. John 14. 9.

7. Believest thou not, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? John 14. 10, 11.

8. All things, that the Father hath, are mine. John 16. 15. Ibid. 17. 10.

9. No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Mat. 11. 27.

10. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. Phil. 2. 5, 6.

V. JESUS CHRIST *is called both* GOD, *and* LORD, *and* JEHOVAH.

The scriptures following will make this sufficiently clear.

1. Unto us a child is born—and his name shall be called—the mighty God. Is. 9. 6.

2. Say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God! Is. 40. 9—11. See too chap. 35. 4, 5.

3. His name shall be called Immanuel; which, being interpreted, is, God with us. Mat. 1. 23.

4. In the beginning was the Word—and the Word was God. John 1. 1.

5. Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. Acts 20. 28.

6. Of

6. Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Rom. 9. 5.

7. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. 2 Cor. 5. 19.

8. God was manifest in the flesh. 1 Tim. 3. 16.

9. Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us. Tit. 2. 13, 14.

10. But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. Heb. 1. 8.

11. This is the true God and eternal life. 1 John 5. 20.

12. Many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. Luke 1. 16.

13. Thomas said unto him, My Lord and my God! John 20. 28.

14. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth. Heb. 1. 10.

15. This is his name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our righteousness. Jer. 23. 6.

VI. VARIOUS *other* DIVINE *Titles are attributed to* JESUS CHRIST *in holy scripture.*

1. *He is Most High:*—Thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his way. Luke 1. 36.

2. *He is the Lord of glory*:—Had they known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. 1 Cor. 2. 8.

3. *He is King of kings and Lord of lords:*—He hath on his vesture, and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords. Rev. 19. 16.

4. *He is Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last:*—Consult in proof of this, Rev. 1. 7, 8, 11, 17, 18. Ibid. 2. 8. Ibid. 22. 12, 13. Compare with these Is. 44. 6. and 48. 11, 12.

5. *He is the Lord of Hosts:*—Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel. Is. 8. 13, 14. Compare 1 Pet. 2. 7, 8, where these words are expressly applied to Jesus Christ. Compare also Is. 6. 1—5, with John 12. 41.

VII. DIVINE ATTRIBUTES *are also ascribed to* JESUS CHRIST *in the sacred writings.*

1. *He is eternal:*—His goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Micah 8. 22. Compare Prov. 8; Heb. 1 and 7 chapters; and John 1. 1—14.

2. *He is omnipresent*:—Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. Mat. 18. 20.—— Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Mat. 28. 20.

3. *He*

3. *He is immutable:*—The heavens shall perish, but thou remainest; they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. Heb. 1. 11, 12.—Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Heb. 13. 8.

4. *He is omnipotent:*—I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. Rev. 1. 8.—He is able to subdue all things to himself. Phil. 3. 21.

5. *He is omniscient:*—Now we are sure that thou knowest all things. John 16. 30.—Lord, thou knowest all things. John 21. 17.—He knew all men. John 2. 24.—He knew what was in man. John 2. 25.—In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Col. 2. 3.—He searcheth the reins and hearts. Rev. 2. 23.—See too Acts 1. 24, 25.

VIII. THE HONOURS *due to God alone are now in heaven, and have been upon earth, attributed to Christ.*

The following scriptures will be satisfactory.

1. *Divine adoration:*—And again, when he bringeth in the First-begotten into the world, he saith, Let all the angels of God worship him. Heb. 1. 6.—The four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. Rev. 5. 8.

2. *Divine praises:* Every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, heard I, saying, Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever. Rev. 5. 13. See also Rev. 1. 5, 6; and 7. 10.

3. *The honour of having a temple:*—Behold, I will send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple. Mal. 3. 1.

4. *The honour of having priests to officiate to* HIM *no less than the Father:*—They shall be priests of God and of Christ. Rev. 20. 6.

5. *The honour of being with his Father the temple of the heavenly Jerusalem:*—The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. Rev. 21. 22.

6. *The honour of being with his Father the light of the heavenly Jerusalem:*—The glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. Rev. 21. 23.

7. *The honour of having the river of the water of life flowing from his throne:*—He shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. Rev. 22. 1.

8. *As the angels in heaven worship Jesus Christ in common with the Father, so men upon earth are commanded to do the same:*—The Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him. John 8. 22, 23.

9. GLORY

9. GLORY *is ascribed to Jesus by the Apostles as well as to the Father*:—The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory forever and ever. 2 Tim. 4. 18.—Consult the context.—Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory, both now and forever. Amen. 2 Pet. 3. 18.—Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father: to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen. Rev. 1. 5, 6.

10. *The common practice of Christians, in the first ages, was, to call on the name of the Lord Jesus*:—And they stoned Stephen, calling upon and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.—Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. Acts 7. 59, 60. Compare Acts 1. 24; Ibid. 9. 14, 21; 22. 16; Rom. 10. 12—14; 1 Cor. 1. 2; 2 Cor. 12. 7—9; 2 Tim. 2. 22; and 1 John 5. 14, 15.

11. *Jesus Christ hath the honour of being the author of grace in common with the Father*:—Grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord. 1 Tim. 1. 2. Rev. 1. 4, 5. See also the introduction to several other of the Epistles.

12. *Jesus Christ hath also the honour of being joined with the Father in the form of baptism*:—Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Mat. 28. 19.

13. *The honour likewise of being united with the Father and the Holy Ghost in solemn benediction*: The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen. 2 Cor. 13. 14.

IX. THE ATONEMENT *made for the sins of the world by the death of the Son of God, a doctrine to which the whole bible, as well as the general history of mankind, bears witness, implies the* DIVINITY *of the Saviour.*

We need only mention one passage on this head, and refer to a few others:—All have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood; to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God—that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Rom. 3. 23—26. See moreover, Is. 53; Dan. 9; John 10; 1 John 2. 1, 2; and the whole Mosaic institution compared with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

APPLICATION.

The above is the substance of what the scripture advances upon this great subject. How any person, who gives the smallest credit to these several declarations of holy writ, can presume to degrade his

his Saviour to the rank of a *mere* man, is not easy to conceive. It is to be feared infidelity is at the bottom. The word of God is not cordially believed. *It was needful*, therefore, *to give all diligence to speak of the common salvation, and to exhort* Christians, *that they earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints*; because *there are certain men crept in unawares, who deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ:* For *as there were false prophets among the Jews, even so there are false teachers among us Christians, who privily bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and whose damnation slumbereth not.* See 1 Pet. 2. 1—3; and Jude 3, 4.

If such is our situation, highly does it become us to watch and be on our guard, *lest any man spoil us through* secular *philosophy and vain deceit*; for let the wise ones of the world say what they please to the contrary, we are assured by the highest authority, that *in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*, and that *all the fulness of the God-head dwelleth bodily in him.* Col. 2. 3, 9. The exhortation of St. Peter, is, therefore, full in point, where he saith—*Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*

To him be glory both now and forever. Amen!!!

22 JY 69

ERRATA.

CONTENTS.

Page	Line	For	Read
2	37	passages and in	passages in
4	23	571—594	549—571

APOLOGY.

7	18	wrecked	wreaked
80	22	1 Cor. 19. 9.	549—571
97	23	The two following passages	The following passage
107	7	his	is
108	2	will	I will
178	24	by	be
241 et alibi	28	Guise	Guyse
246 et alibi	33	Mills	Mill
258	30	namely	name
266	36	Blackwell	Blackwall
290	31	he	the
302	34	Son God	Son of God
355	5	Apostle	Apostles
369	27	fragment	fragrant
377	20	mediate	meditate
378	15	Rabbi, Limborch	Rabbi in Limborch
443	12	to the	to be the
559	32	too	two
563	10	the other hand	on the other hand
589	8	the others	the other
592	22	and hateth	hatest

There are some other literary mistakes, but the above are the principal, I have discovered, which affect the sense.